In the Senate of the United States,

June 15, 1998.

Resolved, That the resolution from the House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 284) entitled "Concurrent resolution revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1998, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1999, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003.", do pass with the following

AMENDMENT:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

1 SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

- 2 FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.
- 3 (a) Declaration.—Congress determines and declares
- 4 that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budg-
- 5 et for fiscal year 1999 including the appropriate budgetary
- 6 levels for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 as re-
- 7 quired by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of
- 8 1974 and revising the budgetary levels for fiscal year 1998

- 1 set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal
- 2 year 1998 as authorized by section 304 of the Congressional
- 3 Budget Act of 1974.
- 4 (b) Table of Contents for
- 5 this concurrent resolution is as follows:
 - Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1999.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

- Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
- Sec. 102. Social Security.
- Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

- Sec. 201. Tax cut reserve fund.
- Sec. 202. Tobacco reserve fund.
- Sec. 203. Separate environmental allocation.
- Sec. 204. Dedication of offsets to transportation.
- Sec. 205. Adjustments for line item veto litigation.
- Sec. 206. Extension of Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.
- Sec. 207. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

- Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate regarding passage of the Senate Finance Committee's IRS restructuring bill.
- Sec. 302. Sense of Congress regarding the sunset of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.
- Sec. 303. Sense of Congress on the tax treatment of home mortgage interest and charitable giving.
- Sec. 304. Sense of the Senate on preservation of Social Security for the future.
- Sec. 305. Sense of the Senate on annual statement of accrued liability of Social Security and Medicare.
- Sec. 306. Sense of the Senate on full funding for IDEA.
- Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate on Social Security.
- Sec. 308. Sense of the Senate on School-to-Work programs.
- Sec. 309. Sense of the Senate regarding taxpayer rights.
- Sec. 310. Sense of the Senate on National Guard funding.
- Sec. 311. Sense of the Senate on Medicare payment.
- Sec. 312. Sense of the Senate on long-term care.
- Sec. 313. Sense of the Senate on climate change research and other funding.
- Sec. 314. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.
- Sec. 315. Sense of the Senate on the formula change for Federal Family Education Loan.
- Sec. 316. Sense of the Senate regarding the deductibility of health insurance premiums of the self-employed.
- Sec. 317. Sense of the Senate on objection to Kyoto Protocol implementation prior to Senate ratification.

- Sec. 318. Sense of the Senate on price increase on tobacco products of \$1.50 per pack.
- Sec. 319. Findings; sense of Congress.
- Sec. 320. Sense of the Senate concerning immunity.
- Sec. 321. Sense of Senate regarding agricultural trade programs.
- Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate supporting long-term entitlement reforms.
- Sec. 323. Sense of Congress regarding freedom of health care choice for Medicare seniors.
- Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate regarding repair and construction needs of Indian schools.
- Sec. 325. Sense of the Senate on Social Security personal retirement accounts and the budget surplus.
- Sec. 326. Sense of the Senate regarding the elimination of the marriage penalty.
- Sec. 327. Findings and sense of Coongress regarding affordable, high-quality health care for seniors.
- Sec. 328. Sense of Congress regarding permanent extension of income averaging for farmers.
- Sec. 329. Sense of the Senate to maintain full funding for the Section 202 Elderly Housing program.
- Sec. 330. Sense of the Senate regarding outlay estimates of the Department of Defense budget.
- Sec. 331. Sense of the Senate regarding outlay estimates for the budgets of Federal agencies other than the Department of Defense.
- Sec. 332. Sense of the Senate regarding an evaluation of the outcome of welfare reform.
- Sec. 333. Sense of the Senate regarding the establishment of a national background check system for long-term care workers.
- Sec. 334. Sense of the Senate on expanding Medicare benefits.
- Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate on battlefield preservation.
- Sec. 336. A resolution regarding the Senate's support for Federal, State and local law enforcement.
- Sec. 337. Sense of the Senate on analysis of civilian science and technology programs in the Federal budget.
- Sec. 338. Sense of the Senate on civilian science and technology programs in the Federal budget.
- Sec. 339. Sense of the Senate on long-term budgeting and repayment of the public debt.
- Sec. 340. Sense of the Senate regarding President's budget.
- Sec. 341. Sense of the Senate regarding the value of the Social Security system for future retirees.
- Sec. 342. Sense of the Senate on the Land and Water Conservation Fund.
- Sec. 343. Sense of the Senate on education goals.
- Sec. 344. Findings and sense of the Senate.
- Sec. 345. Sense of the Senate on INS circuit riders in the former Soviet Union.
- Sec. 346. Sense of the Senate regarding funding for the airport improvement program.
- Sec. 347. Sense of the Senate that the One Hundred Fifth Congress, Second Session should reauthorize funds for the farmland protection program.
- Sec. 348. Sense of the Senate on health care quality.
- Sec. 349. Sense of the Senate regarding wasteful spending in Defense Department acquisition practices.
- Sec. 350. Sense of the Senate regarding the United States response to the changing nature of terrorism.

- Sec. 351. Sense of the Senate on economic growth, Social Security, and Government efficiency.
- Sec. 352. Sense of the Senate regarding a supermajority requirement for raising taxes.
- Sec. 353. Sense of the Senate on health care quality.
- Sec. 354. Sense of the Senate on the use of budget surplus for tax relief or debt reduction.
- Sec. 355. Use of budget surplus to reform Social Security.
- Sec. 356. Sense of the Senate on Colombian drug war helicopters.
- Sec. 357. Sense of the Senate on funding for medical care for veterans.
- Sec. 358. Sense of the Senate on objection to the use of the sale of public lands to fund certain programs.
- Sec. 359. Sense of the Senate regarding a multinational alliance against drug trafficking.
- Sec. 360. Sense of the Senate regarding legislation that increases complexity of tax returns.
- Sec. 361. General prohibition on the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes.
- Sec. 362. Sense of the Senate regarding Amtrak funding.
- Sec. 363. Sense of the Senate regarding market access program.
- Sec. 364. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Institutes of Health.
- Sec. 365. Sense of the Senate regarding display of Ten Commandments.

1 TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

- 2 SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.
- 3 The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the
- 4 fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003.
- 5 (1) Federal Revenues.—For purposes of the en-
- 6 forcement of this resolution—
- 7 (A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues
- 8 are as follows:
- 9 Fiscal year 1998: \$1,262,400,000,000.
- 10 Fiscal year 1999: \$1,300,200,000,000.
- 11 Fiscal year 2000: \$1,325,800,000,000.
- 12 Fiscal year 2001: \$1,369,400,000,000.
- 13 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,431,900,000,000.
- 14 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,486,900,000,000.

1	(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of
2	Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:
3	Fiscal year 1998: \$0.
4	Fiscal year 1999: \$0.
5	Fiscal year 2000: \$0.
6	Fiscal year 2001: \$0.
7	Fiscal year 2002: \$0.
8	Fiscal year 2003: \$0.
9	(C) The amounts for Federal Insurance Con-
10	tributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within
11	the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as fol-
12	lows:
13	Fiscal year 1998: \$117,700,000,000.
14	Fiscal year 1999: \$123,900,000,000.
15	Fiscal year 2000: \$129,700,000,000.
16	Fiscal year 2001: \$135,300,000,000.
17	Fiscal year 2002: \$141,400,000,000.
18	Fiscal year 2003: \$148,100,000,000.
19	(2) New Budget Authority.—For purposes of the
20	enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total
21	new budget authority are as follows:
22	Fiscal year 1998: \$1,374,700,000,000.
23	Fiscal year 1999: \$1,425,300,000,000.
24	Fiscal year 2000: \$1,471,100,000,000.
25	Fiscal year 2001: \$1,513,200,000,000.

```
1
                   Fiscal year 2002: $1,547,200,000,000.
 2
                   Fiscal year 2003: $1,615,800,000,000.
 3
         (3) Budget Outlays.—For purposes of the enforce-
 4
    ment of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget
 5
    outlays are as follows:
 6
                   Fiscal year 1998: $1,358,000,000,000.
 7
                   Fiscal year 1999: $1,408,400,000,000.
 8
                   Fiscal year 2000: $1,450,100,000,000.
 9
                   Fiscal year 2001: $1,490,000,000,000.
10
                   Fiscal year 2002: $1,507,000,000,000.
11
                   Fiscal year 2003: $1,579,200,000,000.
12
         (4) Deficits.—For purposes of the enforcement of this
13
    resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:
14
                   Fiscal year 1998: -$95,600,000,000.
15
                   Fiscal year 1999: -$108,200,000,000.
16
                   Fiscal year 2000: -\$124,300,000,000.
17
                   Fiscal year 2001: -$120,600,000,000.
18
                   Fiscal year 2002: -$75,100,000,000.
19
                   Fiscal year 2003: -$92,300,000,000.
20
         (5) Public Debt.—The appropriate levels of the pub-
21
    lic debt are as follows:
22
                   Fiscal year 1998: $5,482,000,000,000.
23
                   Fiscal year 1999: $5,668,300,000,000.
24
                   Fiscal year 2000: $5,868,700,000,000.
25
                   Fiscal year 2001: $6,064,400,000,000.
```

```
1
                  Fiscal year 2002: $6,220,000,000,000.
 2
                  Fiscal year 2003: $6,392,700,000,000.
 3
   SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.
 4
        (a) Social Security Revenues.—For purposes of
   Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, and 311 of the
   Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues
 6
   of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust
 8
   Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are
   as follows:
10
                  Fiscal year 1998: $417,300,000,000.
11
                  Fiscal year 1999: $438,200,000,000.
12
                  Fiscal year 2000: $457,800,000,000.
13
                  Fiscal year 2001: $477,100,000,000.
14
                  Fiscal year 2002: $497,900,000,000.
15
                  Fiscal year 2003: $520,700,000,000.
16
        (b) Social Security Outlays.—For purposes of
   Senate enforcement under sections 302, 602, and 311 of the
17
18
   Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays
19
   of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust
   Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are
21
   as follows:
22
                  Fiscal year 1998: $313,300,000,000.
23
                  Fiscal year 1999: $212,600,000,000.
24
                  Fiscal year 2000: $331,600,000,000.
25
                  Fiscal year 2001: $344,100,000,000.
```

1	Fiscal year 2002: \$355,700,000,000.
2	Fiscal year 2003: \$369,400,000,000.
3	SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.
4	Congress determines and declares that the appropriate
5	levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct
6	loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commit-
7	ments for fiscal years 1998 through 2003 for each major
8	functional category are:
9	(1) National Defense (050):
10	Fiscal year 1998:
11	(A) New budget authority,
12	\$267,700,000,000.
13	(B) Outlays, \$268,100,000,000.
14	Fiscal year 1999:
15	(A) New budget authority,
16	\$270,500,000,000.
17	(B) Outlays, \$265,500,000,000.
18	Fiscal year 2000:
19	(A) New budget authority,
20	\$274,300,000,000.
21	(B) Outlays, \$268,000,000,000.
22	Fiscal year 2001:
23	(A) New budget authority,
24	\$280,800,000,000.
25	(B) Outlays, \$269,700,000,000.

1	Fiscal year 2002:
2	(A) New budget authority,
3	\$288,600,000,000.
4	(B) Outlays, \$272,100,000,000.
5	Fiscal year 2003:
6	(A) New budget authority,
7	\$296,800,000,000.
8	(B) Outlays, \$279,800,000,000.
9	(2) International Affairs (150):
10	Fiscal year 1998:
11	(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
12	(B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.
13	Fiscal year 1999:
14	(A) New budget authority, \$14,600,000,000.
15	(B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.
16	Fiscal year 2000:
17	(A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.
18	(B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.
19	Fiscal year 2001:
20	(A) New budget authority, \$15,100,000,000.
21	(B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
22	Fiscal year 2002:
23	(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
24	(B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
25	Fiscal year 2003:

1	(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
2	(B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.
3	(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
4	Fiscal year 1998:
5	(A) New budget authority, \$18,000,000,000.
6	(B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.
7	Fiscal year 1999:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$17,900,000,000.
10	Fiscal year 2000:
11	(A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.
12	(B) Outlays, \$17,900,000,000.
13	Fiscal year 2001:
14	(A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.
15	(B) Outlays, \$17,600,000,000.
16	Fiscal year 2002:
17	(A) New budget authority, \$17,300,000,000.
18	(B) Outlays, \$17,400,000,000.
19	Fiscal year 2003:
20	(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.
21	(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.
22	(4) Energy (270):
23	Fiscal year 1998:
24	(A) New budget authority, \$500,000,000.
25	(B) Outlays. \$1,000,000,000.

1	Fiscal year 1999:
2	(A) New budget authority, \$600,000,000.
3	(B) Outlays, \$300,000,000.
4	Fiscal year 2000:
5	(A) New budget authority, \$600,000,000.
6	(B) Outlays, \$0.
7	Fiscal year 2001:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$500,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, $-$200,000,000$.
10	Fiscal year 2002:
11	(A) New budget authority, \$400,000,000.
12	(B) Outlays, $-\$400,000,000$.
13	Fiscal year 2003:
14	(A) New budget authority, \$400,000,000.
15	(B) Outlays, $-\$400,000,000$.
16	(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
17	Fiscal year 1998:
18	(A) New budget authority, \$24,200,000,000.
19	(B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.
20	Fiscal year 1999:
21	(A) New budget authority, \$23,400,000,000.
22	(B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.
23	Fiscal year 2000:
24	(A) New budget authority, \$23,300,000,000.
25	(B) Outlays, \$23,500,000,000.

1	Fiscal year 2001:
2	(A) New budget authority, \$23,000,000,000.
3	(B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.
4	Fiscal year 2002:
5	(A) New budget authority, \$22,900,000,000.
6	(B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.
7	Fiscal year 2003:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$22,900,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$22,900,000,000.
10	(6) Agriculture (350):
11	Fiscal year 1998:
12	(A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.
13	(B) Outlays, \$10,800,000,000.
14	Fiscal year 1999:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$10,500,000,000.
17	Fiscal year 2000:
18	(A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.
19	(B) Outlays, \$9,900,000,000.
20	Fiscal year 2001:
21	(A) New budget authority, \$10,300,000,000.
22	(B) Outlays, \$8,700,000,000.
23	Fiscal year 2002:
24	(A) New budget authority, \$10,200,000,000.
25	(B) Outlans. \$8.500.000.000.

1	Fiscal year 2003:
2	(A) New budget authority, \$10,400,000,000.
3	(B) Outlays, \$8,800,000,000.
4	(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
5	Fiscal year 1998:
6	(A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.
7	(B) Outlays, \$700,000,000.
8	Fiscal year 1999:
9	(A) New budget authority, \$4,200,000,000.
10	(B) Outlays, \$3,200,000,000.
11	Fiscal year 2000:
12	(A) New budget authority, \$15,100,000,000.
13	(B) Outlays, \$10,000,000,000.
14	Fiscal year 2001:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$15,300,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
17	Fiscal year 2002:
18	(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.
19	(B) Outlays, \$11,800,000,000.
20	Fiscal year 2003:
21	(A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
22	(B) Outlays, \$11,700,000,000.
23	(8) Transportation (400):
24	Fiscal year 1998:
25	(A) New budget authority, \$46,000,000,000.

1	(B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.
2	Fiscal year 1999:
3	(A) New budget authority, \$51,500,000,000.
4	(B) Outlays, \$42,800,000,000.
5	Fiscal year 2000:
6	(A) New budget authority, \$51,800,000,000.
7	(B) Outlays, \$44,700,000,000.
8	Fiscal year 2001:
9	(A) New budget authority, \$52,100,000,000.
10	(B) Outlays, \$45,700,000,000.
11	Fiscal year 2002:
12	(A) New budget authority, \$51,400,000,000.
13	(B) Outlays, \$45,800,000,000.
14	Fiscal year 2003:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$52,000,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$46,900,000,000.
17	(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
18	Fiscal year 1998:
19	(A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
20	(B) Outlays, \$11,200,000,000.
21	Fiscal year 1999:
22	(A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
23	(B) Outlays, \$10,900,000,000.
24	Fiscal year 2000:
25	(A) New budget authority, \$7,900,000,000.

1	(B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.
2	Fiscal year 2001:
3	(A) New budget authority, \$7,600,000,000.
4	(B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.
5	Fiscal year 2002:
6	(A) New budget authority, \$7,600,000,000.
7	(B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
8	Fiscal year 2003:
9	(A) New budget authority, \$7,600,000,000.
10	(B) Outlays, \$8,100,000,000.
11	(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social
12	Services (500):
13	Fiscal year 1998:
14	(A) New budget authority, \$61,300,000,000.
15	(B) Outlays, \$56,100,000,000.
16	Fiscal year 1999:
17	(A) New budget authority, \$63,050,000,000.
18	(B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.
19	Fiscal year 2000:
20	(A) New budget authority, \$63,350,000,000.
21	(B) Outlays, \$62,740,000,000.
22	Fiscal year 2001:
23	(A) New budget authority, \$64,550,000,000.
24	(B) Outlays, \$63,849,000,000.
25	Fiscal year 2002:

```
(A) New budget authority, $64,950,000,000.
 1
 2
                  (B) Outlays, $63,750,000,000.
 3
             Fiscal year 2003:
 4
                  (A) New budget authority, $68,450,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, $67,150,000,000.
 5
 6
         (11) Health (550):
             Fiscal year 1998:
 7
 8
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
 9
              $136,200,000,000.
10
                  (B) Outlays, $132,000,000,000.
11
              Fiscal year 1999:
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
12
                  (A)
                            New
13
              $145,800,000,000.
14
                  (B) Outlays, $143,700,000,000.
15
              Fiscal year 2000:
                                                    authority,
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
16
17
              $152,600,000,000.
18
                  (B) Outlays, $151,600,000,000.
19
             Fiscal year 2001:
                            New
20
                  (A)
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
21
              $161,500,000,000.
22
                  (B) Outlays, $160,400,000,000.
23
              Fiscal year 2002:
24
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
25
              $170,100,000,000.
```

```
(B) Outlays, $169,900,000,000.
 1
 2
             Fiscal year 2003:
 3
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
 4
              $181,200,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, $181,100,000,000.
 5
 6
         (12) Medicare (570):
 7
             Fiscal year 1998:
 8
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
 9
              $199,200,000,000.
10
                  (B) Outlays, $199,700,000,000.
11
             Fiscal year 1999:
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
12
                  (A)
                            New
13
              $210,300,000,000.
14
                  (B) Outlays, $210,900,000,000.
15
             Fiscal year 2000:
                                                    authority,
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
16
17
              $221,800,000,000.
18
                  (B) Outlays, $221,100,000,000.
19
             Fiscal year 2001:
                            New
20
                  (A)
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
21
              $239,400,000,000.
22
                  (B) Outlays, $242,300,000,000.
23
             Fiscal year 2002:
24
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
25
              $251,200,000,000.
```

```
(B) Outlays, $248,800,000,000.
 1
 2
              Fiscal year 2003:
 3
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
 4
              $273,400,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, $273,600,000,000.
 5
 6
         (13) Income Security (600):
 7
             Fiscal year 1998:
 8
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
 9
              $229,500,000,000.
10
                  (B) Outlays, $234,700,000,000.
11
              Fiscal year 1999:
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
12
                  (A)
                            New
13
              $243,300,000,000.
14
                  (B) Outlays, $248,100,000,000.
15
              Fiscal year 2000:
                                                    authority,
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
16
17
              $257,300,000,000.
18
                  (B) Outlays, $259,400,000,000.
19
             Fiscal year 2001:
                            New
20
                  (A)
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
21
              $268,500,000,000.
22
                  (B) Outlays, $266,700,000,000.
23
              Fiscal year 2002:
24
                  (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                    authority,
25
              $279,200,000,000.
```

```
1
                   (B) Outlays, $274,200,000,000.
 2
              Fiscal year 2003:
 3
                   (A)
                            New
                                        budget
                                                     authority,
 4
              $289,800,000,000.
 5
                   (B) Outlays, $282,400,000,000.
 6
         (14) Social Security (650):
 7
              Fiscal year 1998:
 8
                   (A) New budget authority, $12,000,000,000.
 9
                   (B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
10
              Fiscal year 1999:
11
                   (A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
12
                   (B) Outlays, $12,800,000,000.
13
              Fiscal year 2000:
14
                   (A) New budget authority, $13,100,000,000.
15
                   (B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
16
              Fiscal year 2001:
17
                   (A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
18
                   (B) Outlays, $12,500,000,000.
19
              Fiscal year 2002:
20
                   (A) New budget authority, $14,500,000,000.
21
                   (B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
22
              Fiscal year 2003:
23
                   (A) New budget authority, $15,300,000,000.
24
                   (B) Outlays, $15,300,000,000.
25
         (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
```

1	Fiscal year 1998:
2	(A) New budget authority, \$42,600,000,000.
3	(B) Outlays, \$42,500,000,000.
4	Fiscal year 1999:
5	(A) New budget authority, \$42,800,000,000.
6	(B) Outlays, \$43,300,000,000.
7	Fiscal year 2000:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$43,400,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$44,000,000,000.
10	Fiscal year 2001:
11	(A) New budget authority, \$44,800,000,000.
12	(B) Outlays, \$45,200,000,000.
13	Fiscal year 2002:
14	(A) New budget authority, \$46,200,000,000.
15	(B) Outlays, \$46,600,000,000.
16	Fiscal year 2003:
17	(A) New budget authority, \$48,200,000,000.
18	(B) Outlays, \$48,600,000,000.
19	(16) Administration of Justice (750):
20	Fiscal year 1998:
21	(A) New budget authority, \$25,100,000,000.
22	(B) Outlays, \$22,500,000,000.
23	Fiscal year 1999:
24	(A) New budget authority, \$25,800,000,000.
25	(B) Outlans. \$24,600,000,000.

1	Fiscal year 2000:
2	(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.
3	(B) Outlays, \$24,900,000,000.
4	Fiscal year 2001:
5	(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.
6	(B) Outlays, \$24,800,000,000.
7	Fiscal year 2002:
8	(A) New budget authority, \$24,700,000,000.
9	(B) Outlays, \$24,300,000,000.
10	Fiscal year 2003:
11	(A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.
12	(B) Outlays, \$24,200,000,000.
13	(17) General Government (800):
14	Fiscal year 1998:
15	(A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.
16	(B) Outlays, \$14,300,000,000.
17	Fiscal year 1999:
18	(A) New budget authority, \$14,400,000,000.
19	(B) Outlays, \$13,400,000,000.
20	Fiscal year 2000:
21	(A) New budget authority, \$13,900,000,000.
22	(B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.
23	Fiscal year 2001:
24	(A) New budget authority, \$13,600,000,000.
25	(B) Outlays, \$13,800,000,000.

```
1
              Fiscal year 2002:
 2
                  (A) New budget authority, $13,400,000,000.
 3
                   (B) Outlays, $13,600,000,000.
             Fiscal year 2003:
 4
                  (A) New budget authority, $13,500,000,000.
 5
                  (B) Outlays, $13,500,000,000.
 6
 7
         (18) Net Interest (900):
 8
              Fiscal year 1998:
 9
                   (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                     authority,
10
              $291,600,000,000.
                  (B) Outlays, $291,600,000,000.
11
             Fiscal year 1999:
12
                                                     authority,
13
                   (A)
                            New
                                       budget
              $300,100,000,000.
14
15
                  (B) Outlays, $300,100,000,000.
              Fiscal year 2000:
16
17
                            New
                   (A)
                                       budget
                                                     authority,
18
              $301,700,000,000.
19
                  (B) Outlays, $301,700,000,000.
             Fiscal year 2001:
20
21
                   (A)
                            New
                                       budget
                                                     authority,
22
              $302,100,000,000.
23
                   (B) Outlays, $302,100,000,000.
24
              Fiscal year 2002:
```

```
budget
                                                 authority,
 1
                 (A)
                           New
 2
             $302,600,000,000.
 3
                 (B) Outlays, $302,600,000,000.
 4
             Fiscal year 2003:
                                budget
 5
                 (A)
                          New
                                                 authority,
 6
             $304,900,000,000.
                 (B) Outlays, $304,900,000,000.
 7
 8
        (19) Allowances (920):
 9
             Fiscal year 1998:
                 (A) New budget authority, -\$0.
10
                 (B) Outlays, -\$0.
11
             Fiscal year 1999:
12
                 (A) New budget authority, -\$300,000,000.
13
14
                 (B) Outlays, -\$1,900,000,000.
15
             Fiscal year 2000:
                                                 authority,
                 (A)
                          New
                                budget
16
17
             -\$1,200,000,000.
                 (B) Outlays, -\$4,600,000,000.
18
19
             Fiscal year 2001:
20
                 (A)
                          New
                                budget
                                                 authority,
21
             -$2,700,000,000.
                 (B) Outlays, -\$3,000,000,000.
22
23
             Fiscal year 2002:
                                budget
24
                 (A)
                          New
                                                 authority,
             -$3,800,000,000.
25
```

```
(B) Outlays, -\$7,000,000,000.
 1
 2
             Fiscal year 2003:
 3
                 (A)
                           New
                                budget
                                                 authority,
 4
             -\$5,400,000,000.
                 (B) Outlays, -\$5,000,000,000.
 5
        (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 6
 7
             Fiscal year 1998:
 8
                 (A)
                           New
                                     budget
                                                 authority,
 9
             -\$36,700,000,000.
                 (B) Outlays, -\$36,700,000,000.
10
             Fiscal year 1999:
11
                                                 authority,
12
                 (A)
                           New
                                    budget
             -$36,300,000,000.
13
                 (B) Outlays, -\$36,300,000,000.
14
15
             Fiscal year 2000:
                 (A)
                           New
                                budget
                                                 authority,
16
             -$36,000,000,000.
17
18
                 (B) Outlays, -\$36,000,000,000.
19
             Fiscal year 2001:
                                budget
20
                 (A)
                           New
                                                 authority,
             −$37,900,000,000.
21
                 (B) Outlays, -\$37,900,000,000.
22
23
             Fiscal year 2002:
                                budget
24
                 (A)
                           New
                                                 authority,
             -$45,000,000,000.
25
```

1	(B) Outlays, $-\$45,000,000,000$.
2	Fiscal year 2003:
3	(A) New budget authority,
4	<i>−\$35,700,000,000</i> .
5	(B) Outlays, $-\$35,700,000,000$.
6	TITLE II—BUDGETARY
7	RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING
8	SEC. 201. TAX CUT RESERVE FUND.
9	(a) In General.—In the Senate, revenue and spend-
10	ing aggregates may only be reduced and allocations may
11	be reduced only for legislation that reduces revenues by pro-
12	viding family tax relief (including relief from the "mar-
13	riage penalty" and support for child care expenses incurred
14	by all parents), and incentives to stimulate savings, invest-
15	ment, job creation, and economic growth (including commu-
16	nity renewal initiatives) if such legislation will not increase
17	the deficit or reduce the surplus for—
18	(1) fiscal year 1999;
19	(2) the period of fiscal years 1999–2003; or
20	(3) the period of fiscal years 2004–2008.
21	(b) Revised Allocations.—Upon the consideration
22	of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of
23	the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with
24	the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section
25	302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised

- 1 aggregates to carry out this section. These revised alloca-
- 2 tions and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes
- 3 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and
- 4 aggregates contained in this resolution.

5 SEC. 202. TOBACCO RESERVE FUND.

- 6 (a) In General.—In the Senate, revenue aggregates
- 7 may be increased for legislation which reserves the Federal
- 8 share of receipts from tobacco legislation only for the Medi-
- 9 care Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.
- 10 (b) Revised Aggregates.—Upon the consideration
- 11 of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of
- 12 the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file in-
- 13 creased aggregates to carry out this section. These aggre-
- 14 gates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congres-
- 15 sional Budget Act of 1974 as the aggregates contained in
- 16 this resolution.
- 17 (c) Application of Section 202 of H. Con. Res.
- 18 67.—For the purposes of enforcement of section 202 of H.
- 19 Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) with respect to this resolu-
- 20 tion, the increase in receipts resulting from tobacco legisla-
- 21 tion shall not be taken into account.

22 SEC. 203. SEPARATE ENVIRONMENTAL ALLOCATION.

- 23 (a) In General.—In the Senate, revenue and spend-
- 24 ing aggregates may be increased and allocations may be
- 25 increased only for legislation that reauthorizes and reforms

- 1 the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of hazard2 ous waste sites if such legislation will not increase the defi-
- 3 cit or reduce the surplus for—
- 4 (1) fiscal year 1999;
- 5 (2) the period of fiscal years 1999–2003; or
- 6 (3) the period of fiscal years 2004–2008.
- 7 (b) REVISED AGGREGATES.—In the Senate, after the
- 8 Committee on Environment and Public Works reports a bill
- 9 (or after the submission of a conference report thereon) to
- 10 reform the Superfund program to facilitate the cleanup of
- 11 hazardous waste sites that does not exceed—
- 12 (1) \$200,000,000 in budget authority and out-
- 13 lays for fiscal year 1999; and
- 14 (2) \$1,000,000,000 in budget authority and out-
- lays for the period of fiscal years 1999 through 2003;
- 16 the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate
- 17 may increase the appropriate aggregates and the appro-
- 18 priate allocations of budget authority in this resolution by
- 19 the amounts provided in that bill for that purpose and the
- 20 outlays flowing in all years from such budget authority.
- 21 These revised allocations and aggregates shall be considered
- 22 for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974
- 23 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this resolu-
- 24 *tion*.

1 SEC. 204. DEDICATION OF OFFSETS TO TRANSPORTATION.

- 2 (a) Spending Reserve.—In accordance with section
- 3 312(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and for the
- 4 purposes of title III of that Act, the Chairman of the Com-
- 5 mittee on the Budget may reserve the estimated reductions
- 6 in new budget authority and outlays resulting from changes
- 7 in legislation affecting the programs specified in subsection
- 8 (b), if contained in the Department of Transportation and
- 9 Related Agencies Appropriations Act, for the purpose of off-
- 10 setting—
- 11 (1) additional outlays not to exceed
- 12 \$1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 and
- 13 \$18,500,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003
- 14 for discretionary highway programs as called for in
- 15 the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
- 16 of 1998; and
- 17 (2) additional budget authority not to exceed
- 18 \$1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 and
- 19 \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 through 2003 for
- 20 discretionary transit programs as called for in the
- 21 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of
- *1998.*
- 23 (b) Offsets.—The following reductions in mandatory
- 24 spending are reserved in function 920, Allowances, for pur-
- 25 poses of subsection (a):

- 1 (1) For reductions in programs in function 350,
 2 Agriculture: For fiscal year 1999, \$107,000,000 in
 3 budget authority and \$107,000,000 in outlays; For
 4 fiscal years 1999–2003, \$603,000,000 in budget authority and \$598,000,000 in outlays.
 - (2) For reductions in programs in function 370,
 Commerce and Housing Credit: For fiscal year 1999,
 \$242,000,000 in budget authority and \$242,000,000
 in outlays; For fiscal years 1999–2003,
 \$1,195,000,000 in budget authority and
 \$1,195,000,000 in outlays.
 - (3) For reductions in programs in function 500, Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services: For fiscal year 1999, \$471,000,000 in budget authority and \$424,000,000 in outlays; For fiscal years 1999–2003, \$3,182,000,000 in budget authority and \$3,079,000,000 in outlays.
 - (4) For reductions in programs in function 550, Health: For fiscal year 1999, \$250,000,000 in budget authority and \$250,000,000 in outlays; For fiscal years 1999–2003, \$1,900,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,900,000,000 in outlays.
 - (5) For reductions in programs in function 600, Income Security: For fiscal year 1999, \$260,000,000 in budget authority and \$260,000,000 in outlays; For

1	fiscal years 1999–2003, \$1,700,000,000 in budget au-
2	thority and \$1,700,000,000 in outlays.
3	(6) For reductions in programs in function 700,
4	Veterans Benefits and Services: For fiscal year 1999,
5	\$500,000,000 in budget authority and \$500,000,000
6	in outlays; For fiscal years 1999–2003,
7	\$10,500,000,000 in budget authority and
8	\$10,500,000,000 in outlays.
9	(c) Sense of the Senate on VA Compensation and
10	Post-Service Smoking-Related Illnesses.—
11	(1) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
12	(A) the President has twice included in his
13	budgets a prohibition on the entitlement expan-
14	sion that the Department of Veterans Affairs (re-
15	ferred to as the "VA") is proposing to allow post-
16	service smoking-related illness to be eligible for
17	$V\!A\ compensation;$
18	(B) Congress has never acted on this entitle-
19	ment expansion;
20	(C) the Congressional Budget Office and the
21	Office of Management and Budget have con-
22	cluded that this change in VA policy would re-
23	sult in at least \$10,000,000,000 over 5 years and
24	\$45,000,000,000 over 10 years in additional
25	mandatory costs to the VA;

- (D) these increased number of claims and the resulting costs may present undue delay and hardship on veterans seeking claim review; (E) the entitlement expansion apparently runs counter to all existing VA policy, including a statement by former Secretary Brown that "It is inappropriate to compensate for death or dis-ability resulting from veterans' personal choice to engage in conduct damaging to their health."; and
 - (F) Secretary Brown's comment was recently reaffirmend by Acting Secretary of Veterans Affairs Togo West, who stated "It has been the position of the Department and of my predecessor that the decision to use tobacco by service members is a personal decision and is not a requirement for military service. And that therefore to compensate veterans for diseases whose sole connection to service is a veteran's own tobacco use should not rest with the Government.".
 - (2) Sense of the sense of the Senate that the function totals and assumptions underlying this resolution assume the following:

1	(A) The support of the President's proposal
2	to not allow post-service smoking related illnesses
3	to be eligible for VA.
4	(B) The study and report required by sub-
5	paragraph (C) will be completed.
6	(C) The Secretary of the Department of Vet-
7	erans Affairs, the Office of Management and
8	Budget, and the General Accounting Office are
9	jointly required to—
10	(i) jointly study (referred to in this
11	section as the "study") the VA General
12	Counsel's determination and the resulting
13	actions to change the compensation rules to
14	include disability and death benefits for
15	conditions related to the use of tobacco
16	products during service; and
17	(ii) deliver an opinion as to whether
18	illnesses resulting from post-service smoking
19	should be considered as a compensable dis-
20	ability.
21	(D) The study should include—
22	(i) the estimated numbers of those fil-
23	ing such claims, the cost resulting from such
24	benefits, the time necessary to review such
25	claims, and how such a number of claims

1	will affect the VA's ability to review its cur-
2	rent claim load;
3	(ii) an examination of how the pro-
4	posed change corresponds to prior VA policy
5	relating to post-service actions taken by an
6	individual; and
7	(iii) what Federal benefits, both VA
8	and non-VA, former service members having
9	smoking-related illnesses are eligible to re-
10	ceive.
11	(E) The study shall be completed no later
12	than July 1, 1999.
13	(F) The Department of Veterans Affairs and
14	the Office of Management and Budget shall re-
15	port their finding to the Majority and Minority
16	Leaders of the Senate and the chairmen and
17	ranking minority members of the Senate Budget
18	and Veterans' Affairs Committees.
19	SEC. 205. ADJUSTMENTS FOR LINE ITEM VETO LITIGATION.
20	If the Supreme Court rules that the Line Item Veto
21	Act is unconstitutional, the Chairman of the Committee on
22	the Budget may make appropriate adjustments to the allo-
23	cations and aggregates in this resolution to reflect the effects
24	of the President's cancellations becoming null and void.

1	SEC. 206. EXTENSION OF VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION
2	TRUST FUND.
3	(a) Discretionary Limits.—In the Senate, in this
4	section and for the purposes of allocations made for the dis-
5	cretionary category pursuant to section 302(a) of the Con-
6	gressional Budget Act of 1974, the term "discretionary
7	spending limit" means—
8	(1) with respect to fiscal year 1999—
9	(A) for the defense category:
10	\$271,570,000,000 in new budget authority and
11	\$266,635,000,000 in outlays;
12	(B) for the nondefense category:
13	\$255,450,000,000 in new budget authority and
14	\$289,547,000,000 in outlays; and
15	(C) for the violent crime reduction category:
16	\$5,800,000,000 in new budget authority and
17	\$4,953,000,000 in outlays;
18	(2) with respect to fiscal year 2000—
19	(A) for the discretionary category:
20	\$532,693,000,000 in new budget authority and
21	\$558,711,000,000 in outlays; and
22	(B) for the violent crime reduction category:
23	\$4,500,000,000 in new budget authority and
24	\$5,554,000,000 in outlays;
25	(3) with respect to fiscal year 2001—

1	(A) for the discretionary category:
2	\$537,632,000,000 in new budget authority and
3	\$558,415,000,000 in outlays; and
4	(B) for the violent crime reduction category:
5	\$4,400,000,000 in new budget authority and
6	\$5,981,000,000 in outlays; and
7	(4) with respect to fiscal year 2002—
8	(A) for the discretionary category:
9	\$546,574,000,000 in new budget authority and
10	\$556,269,000,000 in outlays; and
11	(B) for the violent crime reduction category:
12	\$4,500,000,000 in new budget authority and
13	\$4,530,000,000 in outlays;
14	as adjusted in strict conformance with subsection (b) of sec-
15	tion 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit
16	Control Act of 1985 and section 314 of the Congressional
17	Budget Act.
18	(b) Point of Order in the Senate.—
19	(1) In general.—Except as provided in para-
20	graph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to
21	consider—
22	(A) a revision of this resolution or any con-
23	current resolution on the budget for fiscal years
24	1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 (or amendment, mo-
25	tion, or conference report on such a resolution)

- that provides discretionary spending in excess of
 the discretionary spending limit or limits for
 such fiscal year; or
 - (B) any bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such bill or resolution) for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 that would cause any of the limits in this section (or suballocations of the discretionary limits made pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) to be exceeded.
- 11 (2) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply if 12 a declaration of war by the Congress is in effect or 13 if a joint resolution pursuant to section 258 of the 14 Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act 15 of 1985 has been enacted.
- 16 (c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or sus-17 pended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-18 fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.
- (d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the deci-20 sions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section 21 shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, 22 and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the 23 concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case 24 may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members 25 of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- 1 the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair
- 2 on a point of order raised under this section.
- 3 (e) Determination of Budget Levels.—For pur-
- 4 poses of this section, the levels of new budget authority, out-
- 5 lays, new entitlement authority, revenues, and deficits for
- 6 a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates
- 7 made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

8 SEC. 207. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

- 9 Congress adopts the provisions of this title—
- 10 (1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the
 11 Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively,
 12 and as such they shall be considered as part of the
 13 rules of each House, or of that House to which they
 14 specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede
 15 other rules only to the extent that they are inconsist16 ent therewith; and
 - (2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

17

18

19

20

1	TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS
2	AND THE SENATE
3	SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PASSAGE OF
4	THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE'S IRS RE-
5	STRUCTURING BILL.
6	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
7	(1) the House of Representatives passed H.R.
8	2676 on November 5, 1997;
9	(2) the Finance Committee of the Senate has held
10	several days of hearings this year on Internal Reve-
11	nue Service restructuring proposals;
12	(3) the hearings demonstrated many areas in
13	which the House-passed bill could be improved;
14	(4) on March 31, 1998, the Senate Finance Com-
15	mittee voted 20–0 to report an Internal Revenue
16	Service restructuring package that contains more
17	oversight over the Internal Revenue Service, more ac-
18	countability for employees, and a new arsenal of tax-
19	payer protections; and
20	(5) the Senate Finance package includes the fol-
21	lowing items which were not included in the House
22	bill—
23	(A) removal of the statutory impediments to
24	the Commissioner of Internal Revenue's efforts to

1	reorganize the agency to create a more stream-
2	lined, taxpayer-friendly organization,
3	(B) the providing of real oversight authority
4	for the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board
5	to help prevent taxpayer abuse,
6	(C) the creation of a new Treasury Inspec-
7	tor General for Tax Administration to ensure
8	independence and accountability,
9	(D) real, meaningful relief for innocent
10	spouses,
11	(E) provisions which abate penalties and
12	interest after 1 year so that the Internal Revenue
13	Service does not profit from its own delay,
14	(F) provisions which ensure due process of
15	law to taxpayers by granting them a right to a
16	hearing before the Internal Revenue Service can
17	pursue a lien, levy, or seizure,
18	(G) provisions which forbid the Internal
19	Revenue Service from coercing taxpayers to ex-
20	tend the 10-year statute of limitations for collec-
21	tion,
22	(H) provisions which require the Internal
23	Revenue Service to terminate employees who
24	abuse taxpayers or other Internal Revenue Serv-
25	ice employees,

1	(I) provisions which make the Taxpayer
2	Advocate more independent, and
3	(I) provisions enabling the Commissioner of
4	Internal Revenue to manage employees more ef-
5	fectively.
6	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
7	ate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals
8	in this budget resolution assume that the Senate shall, as
9	expeditiously as possible, consider and pass an Internal
10	Revenue Service restructuring bill which provides the most
11	taxpayer protections, the greatest degree of Internal Reve-
12	nue Service employee accountability, and enhanced over-
13	sight.
14	SEC. 302. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE SUNSET
15	OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.
16	(a) Findings.—Congress finds that a simple and fair
17	Federal tax system is one that—
18	(1) applies a low tax rate, through easily under-
10	-tt
19	stood laws, to all Americans;
20	(2) provides tax relief for working Americans;
20	(2) provides tax relief for working Americans;
20 21	(2) provides tax relief for working Americans;(3) protects the rights of taxpayers and reduces
202122	(2) provides tax relief for working Americans;(3) protects the rights of taxpayers and reduces tax collection abuses;

1	(6) does not penalize marriage or families; and
2	(7) provides for a taxpayer-friendly collections
3	process to replace the Internal Revenue Service.
4	(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress
5	that the provisions of this resolution assume that all taxes
6	imposed under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall sun-
7	set for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2001
8	(or in the case of any tax not imposed on the basis of a
9	taxable year, on any taxable event or for any period after
10	December 31, 2001) and that a new Federal tax system will
11	be enacted that is both simple and fair as described in sub-
12	section (a) and that provides only those resources for the
13	Federal Government that are needed to meet its responsibil-
14	ities to the American people.
15	SEC. 303. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE TAX TREATMENT OF
16	HOME MORTGAGE INTEREST AND CHARI-
17	TABLE GIVING.
18	(a) Findings.—Congress finds that—
19	(1) current Federal income tax laws embrace a
20	number of fundamental tax policies including long-
21	standing encouragement for home ownership and
22	charitable giving, expanded health and retirement
23	benefits;
24	(2) the mortgage interest deduction is among the
25	most important incentives in the income tax code and

- promotes the American Dream of home ownership—
 the single largest investment for most families, and
 preserving it is critical for the more than 20,000,000
 families claiming it now and for millions more in the
 future;
 - (3) favorable tax treatment to encourage gifts to charities is a longstanding principle that helps charities raise funds needed to provide services to poor families and others when government is simply unable or unwilling to do so, and maintaining this tax incentive will help charities raise money to meet the challenges of their charitable missions in the decades ahead;
 - (4) legislation has been proposed to repeal the entire income tax code at the end of the year 2001 without providing a specific replacement; and
 - (5) sunsetting the entire income tax code without describing a replacement threatens our Nation's future economic growth and unwisely eliminates existing tax incentives that are crucial for taxpayers who are often making the most important financial decisions of their lives.
- 23 (b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress 24 that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress sup-25 ports the continued tax deductibility of home mortgage in-

1	terest and charitable contributions and that a sunset of the
2	tax code that does not provide a replacement tax system
3	that preserves this deductibility could damage the American
4	dream of home ownership and could threaten the viability
5	of nonprofit institutions.
6	SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PRESERVATION OF SO-
7	CIAL SECURITY FOR THE FUTURE.
8	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
9	(1) Social Security is one of the Nation's most
10	important income security programs;
11	(2) the preservation of Social Security both for
12	those now retired and for future generations of work-
13	ing Americans is a vital national priority;
14	(3) the Trustees of the Federal Old Age and Sur-
15	vivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust
16	Funds have reported to Congress that—
17	(A) the retirement of the baby boom genera-
18	tion will cause Social Security expenditures to
19	accelerate rapidly beginning around 2010;
20	(B) Social Security expenditures will exceed
21	Social Security revenues after 2012 and the trust
22	funds will be depleted of reserves in 2029; and
23	(C) after 2029, tax revenues will be suffi-
24	cient to cover only three-fourths of the benefits
25	promised under current law, and, by the end of

- the 75 year projection period, the annual deficit
 in the trust funds will reach 2.1 percent of the
 GDP;
 (4) Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal
 - (4) Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has testified before Congress that Social Security's unfunded liability stands at around \$3,000,000,000,000 and advised Congress to move expeditiously to reform the program so that current workers will have sufficient time to adjust to any changes in the program;
 - (5) the \$124,000,000,000 in new domestic spending programs in the President's budget undermines

 Social Security by diverting resources from budget surpluses to a bigger government and more spending;

 and
 - (6) the Medicare Hospital Insurance program is projected to become insolvent in 2010 and a study by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University estimated that 14 percent of Medicare spending in 1995 was for tobaccorelated illnesses.
- (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—
- (1) Congress should use unified budget surpluses
 to reform Social Security for future generations; and

1	(2) Congress should reserve the Federal proceeds
2	from any tobacco settlement for saving Medicare until
3	legislation is enacted to make Medicare actuarially
4	sound.
5	SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANNUAL STATEMENT
6	OF ACCRUED LIABILITY OF SOCIAL SECURITY
7	AND MEDICARE.
8	It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this
9	resolution assume that—
10	(1) the concurrent resolution on the budget
11	should include a statement of the current accrued li-
12	ability of the Federal Government for future pay-
13	ments under the Social Security and Medicare pro-
14	grams; and
15	(2) the President's budget should include for fis-
16	cal years beginning with 1999 a statement of the cur-
17	rent accrued liability of the Federal Government for
18	future payments under the Social Security and Medi-
19	care programs.
20	SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FULL FUNDING FOR
21	IDEA.
22	It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels
23	in this resolution assume that part B of the Individuals
24	with Disabilities Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seg.) should be fully

funded at the originally promised level before any funds are appropriated for new education programs. 3 SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY. 4 (a) Findings.—The Senate finds that— (1) the Social Security program, created in 1935 5 6 to provide old-age survivors, and disability insurance 7 benefits, has been one of the most successful govern-8 ment programs ever; 9 (2) in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 10 1990, Congress created section 13301 of the Congres-11 sional Budget Act, which removed Social Security 12 spending and revenues from all Federal budget cal-13 culations: 14 (3) under current budget law, the Federal budget 15 is still in deficit; and 16 (4) in his State of the Union message on Janu-17 ary 27, 1998, President Clinton called on Congress to 18 "save Social Security first" and to "reserve one hun-19 dred percent of the surplus, that is any penny of the 20 surplus, until we have taken all the necessary meas-21 ures to strengthen the Social Security system for the 22 twenty-first century". 23 (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals included in this resolution assume—

1	(1) Congress and the President should continue
2	to rid our country of debt and work to balance the
3	budget without counting Social Security trust fund
4	surpluses; and
5	(2) Congress and the President should work in a
6	bipartisan way on specific legislation to reform the
7	Social Security system, to ensure that it is finan-
8	cially sound over the long term and will be available
9	for all future generations.
10	SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SCHOOL-TO-WORK
11	PROGRAMS.
12	It is the sense of the Senate that the budget totals and
13	levels in this resolution assume the President's policy with
14	respect to the School-to-Work program under the Education
15	Reform Account and any such savings as a result should
16	be applied to local initiatives focusing on early childhood
17	development.
18	SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAXPAYER
19	RIGHTS.
20	It is the sense of the Senate that of revenues designated
21	under section 201 for tax relief, a portion be set aside for—
22	(1) improvement of taxpayer rights, including
23	protections for taxpayers in cases involving seizure of
24	property by the Internal Revenue Service; and

1	(2) reform of the penalty rules under the Inter-
2	nal Revenue Code of 1986.
3	SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON NATIONAL GUARD
4	FUNDING.
5	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:
6	(1) The Army National Guard represents 34 per-
7	cent of total Army forces, including 55 percent of
8	combat divisions and brigades, 46 percent of combat
9	support, and 25 percent of combat service support.
10	(2) The Army National Guard receives just 9.5
11	percent of Army funds.
12	(3) A recent military study estimates the average
13	cost to train and equip an active duty soldier is
14	\$73,000 per year, while the average cost to train and
15	equip a National Guard soldier is just \$17,000 per
16	year.
17	(4) The Constitution of the United States pro-
18	vides for a specific role for the National Guard in our
19	national defense.
20	(5) The National Guard will play an increasing
21	role in a variety of ongoing worldwide operations by
22	relieving active units and reducing the operational
23	and personnel burdens of the Army's frequent and
24	lengthy deployments.

(6) The home land defense is a mission of grow-
ing importance for our military forces and the Na-
tional Guard forces will play an increasingly key role
in that mission.
(7) Congress created the National Defense Panel
to recommend ways in which to transform United
States defense and national security policy for the
21st century and it reached the following rec-
ommendations:
(A) Some portion of the Army National
Guard's divisional combat units (including com-
bat support) should become part of active divi-
sions and brigades.
(B) The National Guard's enhanced bri-
gades should report to an active Army command.
(C) The Guard should develop selected
early-deploying units that would join the active
component.
(D) Some additional reserve or Guard units
may be needed to reduce pressure on the active
Army.
(E) The Guard should assume the entire
U.S. Army South (USARSO) mission, the Army
component of the United States Southern Com-

mand (Southcom) based in Panama.

1	(F) The National Guard should continue to
2	provide general purpose forces to give prompt
3	military support to civil authorities.
4	(G) The National Guard should provide
5	forces organized and equipped for training of
6	civil agencies and the immediate reinforcement
7	of first-response efforts in domestic emergencies.
8	(H) New homeland defense missions develop
9	(e.g., National Missile Defense and information
10	warfare), the Guard should be used in lieu of ac-
11	tive forces wherever possible.
12	(8) The National Guard estimates it was under-
13	funded by \$743,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and by
14	\$634,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.
15	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
16	ate that the functional totals in the budget resolution as-
17	sume that the Department of Defense will give the highest
18	priority to moving toward fully funding the National
19	Guard.
20	SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MEDICARE PAYMENT.
21	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
22	(1) one of the goals of the Balanced Budget Act
23	of 1997 was to expand options for Medicare bene-
24	ficiaries under the new Medicare+Choice program;
25	and

1	(2) the new Medicare payment formula in the
2	Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was intended to make
3	these choices available to all Americans, but because
4	of the low update and specific budget neutrality pro-
5	visions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the blend-
6	ing of rates to create greater equity for rural and
7	other lower payment areas was not implemented in
8	1998 or 1999.
9	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
10	ate that the functional totals underlying this concurrent res-
11	olution on the budget assume that funding the blending of
12	local and national payment rates pursuant to the Balanced
13	Budget Act of 1997 should be a priority for the Senate Fi-
14	nance Committee this year within the budget as established
15	by this Committee.
16	SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LONG-TERM CARE.
17	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
18	(1) our Nation is not financially prepared to
19	meet the long-term care needs of its rapidly aging
20	population and that long-term care needs threaten the
21	financial security of American families; and
22	(2) many people are unaware that most long-
23	term care costs are not covered by Medicare and that
24	Medicaid covers long-term care only after the person's
25	assets have been exhausted

- 1 (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate that—
- 3 (1) this concurrent resolution on the budget assumes that the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare should, as part of its delibera-5 6 tions, describe long-term care needs and make all ap-7 propriate recommendations including private sector 8 options that reflect the need for a continuum of care 9 that spans from acute to long-term care. This is not 10 a specific recommendation that any new program be 11 added to Medicare;
 - (2) the Federal Government should take all appropriate steps to inform the public about the financial risks posed by long-term care costs and about the need for families to plan for their long-term care needs;
 - (3) the Federal Government should take all appropriate steps to inform the public that Medicare does not cover most long-term care costs and that Medicaid covers long-term care costs only when the beneficiary has exhausted his or her assets;
 - (4) the appropriate committees of the Senate, together with the Department of Health and Human Services and other appropriate Executive Branch agencies, should develop specific ideas for encouraging

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 Americans to plan for their own long-term care needs; 2 and
- (5) the upcoming National Summit on Retire ment Income Savings should ensure that planning for
 long-term care is an integral part of any discussion
 of retirement security.

7 SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CLIMATE CHANGE RE-

- 8 **SEARCH AND OTHER FUNDING.**
- 9 It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions un-10 derlying the functional totals in this resolution assume the 11 following:
- 12 (1) To the extent that funding is made available 13 through grants or other Federal expenditures to re-14 duce emissions of carbon dioxide or other greenhouse 15 gases or to increase sequestration of carbon to offset 16 such emissions, such funding shall be made available 17 through competitive, merit-based awards designed to 18 select cost-effective methods for reducing, sequestering, 19 or mitigating such emissions. Such awards shall con-20 sider all technologies, methods, and research for reduc-21 ing, sequestering, or mitigating emissions, including 22 sustainable agricultural practices and forest manage-23 ment and conservation strategies. Funding criteria 24 shall be comprehensive in scope, not limited to spe-25 cific technologies or industries, awarded on a non-

discriminatory basis, and target cost-effectiveness in reducing, sequestering, or mitigating carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases through natural resource management programs or products. In considering the cost-effectiveness of various reduction, sequestration, or mitigation technologies, other environmental benefits should be considered.

(2) To the extent any tax credits or other tax incentives are created to stimulate the adoption of technologies or practices that reduce, sequester, or mitigate emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases ("emissions tax incentives"), such emission tax incentives shall also be available to any person that employs an alternative technology or practice that reduces, sequesters, or mitigates emissions of carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gases as effectively as those technologies or practices for which a tax credit or other incentive is provided. Only payments for technologies or in support of practices not legally required when payment is made shall qualify for tax incentives.

- 22 SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING
- FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT
- 24 BLOCK GRANT.
- 25 (a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1	(1) 54 percent of women in the labor force have
2	children under 13 and are either single parents or
3	have husbands who earn less than \$30,000 per year;
4	(2) in 1995, 62 percent of women with children
5	younger than age 6, and 77 percent of women with
6	children ages 6–17 were in the labor force, and 59
7	percent of women with children younger than 3 were
8	in the labor force;
9	(3) a 1997 General Accounting Office study
10	found that the increased work participation require-
11	ments of the welfare reform law will cause the need
12	for child care to exceed the known supply;
13	(4) a 1995 study by the Urban Institute of child
14	care prices in 6 cities found that the average cost of
15	care for a 2-year-old in a child care center ranged
16	from \$3,100 to \$8,100;
17	(5) for an entry-level worker, the family's child
18	care costs at the average price of care for an infant
19	in a child care center would be at least 50 percent of
20	family income in 5 of the 6 cities examined;
21	(6) 40 percent of children under the age of 5 are
22	taken care of at home by 1 parent;
23	(7) a large number of low- and middle-income
24	families sacrifice a second full-time income so that a

parent may be at home with the child;

1	(8) the average income of 2-parent families with
2	a single income is \$20,000 less than the average in-
3	come of 2-parent families with 2 incomes;
4	(9) the recent National Institute for Child
5	Health and Development study found that the greatest
6	factor in the development of a young child is "what
7	is happening at home and in families"; and
8	(10) increased tax relief directed at making child
9	care more affordable, and increased funding for the
10	Child Care and Development Block Grant, would take
11	significant steps toward bringing quality child care
12	within the reach of many parents, and would increase
13	the options available to parents in deciding how best
14	to care for their children.
15	(b) Sense of Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate
16	that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pur-
17	suant to this resolution assume—
18	(1) that tax relief should be directed at parents
19	who are struggling to afford quality child care, in-
20	cluding those who wish to stay at home to care for a
21	child, and should be included in any tax cut package;
22	and
23	(2) doubling funding for the Child Care and De-
24	velopment Block Grant will significantly increase the

1	States' ability to deliver quality child care to low-in-
2	come working families.
3	SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE FORMULA
4	CHANGE FOR FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION
5	LOAN.
6	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:
7	(1) Postsecondary students receive critical access
8	to a higher education through student loans made
9	available by lenders in the Federal Family Education
10	Loan (FFEL) program.
11	(2) Guaranteed student loan borrowers currently
12	pay an interest rate on their FFEL loans equal to the
13	91-day Treasury bill rate plus 2.5 percent while the
14	borrower attends school, and the 91-day Treasury bill
15	rate plus 3.1 percent during repayment. In addition,
16	the maximum FFEL student loan rate is capped as
17	8.25 percent.
18	(3) As a result of the Omnibus Budget Reconcili-
19	ation Act of 1993, the new formula for FFEL student
20	loans, effective July 1, 1998, will be equal to the 10-
21	year Treasury bond rate plus 1 percent. In addition,
22	the same 8.25 percent rate cap would apply to these
23	new loans.
24	(4) Lenders in the FFEL program have alerted
25	Congress that the scheduled formula change will make

- these loans unprofitable. As a result, lenders may withdraw from the FFEL program or significantly reduce their participation in the program after July 1, 1998.
 - (5) A July 25, 1997 report by the Congressional Research Service stated that the scheduled formula change "can result in a greater likelihood that the program will become unprofitable at certain points in the business cycle," and "the result could be a shutdown of the guaranteed delivery system.".
 - (6) In a report by the Treasury Department on February 26, 1998, the Clinton Administration concluded that the new formula will provide a rate of return on student loans that is below the target rate of return of for-profit bank lenders in the guaranteed student loan program. Furthermore, the Administration concluded that there are inefficiencies associated with the proposed formula, and joint benefits could be realized to students and lenders from moving back to a short-term index.
 - (7) At the time that the proposed formula change was adopted in 1993, the rate of return to lenders would have been higher under the proposed formula than under the existing formula.

1	(8) The withdrawal of lenders from the FFEL
2	program, who now account for approximately 70 per-
3	cent of all student loans, would be devastating to stu-
4	dents because, as the Administration has acknowl-
5	edged, the Federal direct loan program would be un-
6	able to absorb the demand for student loans that
7	would arise from the absence of guaranteed lenders.
8	(9) A variety of proposals have been put forward
9	to resolve this pending crisis in the FFEL program
10	by modifying the scheduled formula change.
11	(b) Sense of Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate
12	that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pur-
13	suant to this resolution assume that the documented prob-
14	lems that will rise from the scheduled formula change for
15	the Federal Family Education Loan program should be re-
16	solved in a manner that ensures that students are not
17	harmed by the withdrawal of lenders from this program.
18	SEC. 316. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE DEDUCT-
19	IBILITY OF HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS
20	OF THE SELF-EMPLOYED.
21	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
22	(1) under current law, the self-employed do not
23	enjoy parity with their corporate competitors with re-
24	spect to the deductibility of their health insurance
25	premiums;

(2) at present, the self-employed can deduct only
 45 percent of their health insurance premiums;

- (3) scheduled changes in the deductible amount of health insurance premiums will rise slowly, to only 60 percent by 2002;
- (4) only by 2007 will the self-employed enjoy equitable treatment with their corporate competitors with respect to the deductibility of their health insurance premiums;
- (5) the limited deductibility available to the selfemployed greatly reduces the affordability of their health insurance;
- (6) these disadvantages faced by the self-employed are exacerbated by the fact that the self-employed generally pay higher premium rates because they do not have access to group insurance plans;
- (7) these disadvantages are reflected in the higher rate of lack of insurance among self-employed individuals that stands at 23.6 percent compared with 17.4 percent for all other wage and salaried workers, for self-employed living at or below the poverty level the rate of uninsured is over 57 percent, for self-employed living at 100–150 percent poverty the rate of uninsured is 47 percent, and for self-employed living

1	at 150–199 percent the rate of uninsured is 40 per-
2	cent;
3	(8) for some self-employed, such as farmers who
4	face significant occupational safety hazards, this lack
5	of health insurance affordability has even greater
6	ramifications; and
7	(9) this lack of full deductibility is adversely af-
8	fecting the growing number of women who own small
9	businesses.
10	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
11	ate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals
12	in this resolution assume that legislation implementing this
13	concurrent resolution on the budget should include acceler-
14	ated movement toward parity between the self-employed
15	and corporations with respect to the tax treatment of health
16	insurance premiums, while maintaining deficit neutrality.
17	SEC. 317. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON OBJECTION TO KYOTO
18	PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION PRIOR TO SEN-
19	ATE RATIFICATION.
20	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:
21	(1) The agreement reached by the Administra-
22	tion in Kyoto, Japan, regarding legally binding com-
23	mitments on greenhouse gas reductions is inconsistent
24	with the provisions of S. Res. 98, The Byrd-Hagel

1	Resolution, that passed the United States Senate
2	unanimously.
3	(2) The Administration has pledged to Congress
4	that it would not implement any portion of the Kyoto
5	Protocol prior to its ratification in the Senate.
6	(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress
7	that funds should not be provided to put in effect the Kyoto
8	Protocol prior to the Senate ratification in compliance with
9	the requirements of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution and consist-
10	ent with Administration assurances to Congress.
11	SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PRICE INCREASE ON
12	TOBACCO PRODUCTS OF \$1.50 PER PACK.
13	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
14	(1) smoking rates among children and teenagers
15	have reached epidemic proportions;
16	(2) of the 3,000 children and teenagers who begin
17	smoking every day, 1,000 will eventually die of smok-
18	ing-related disease; and
19	(3) public health experts and economists agree
20	that the most effective and efficient way to achieve
21	major reduction in youth smoking rates is to raise the
22	price of tobacco products by at least \$1.50 per pack.
23	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
24	ate that comprehensive tobacco legislation should increase
25	the price of each pack of cigarettes sold by at least \$1.50

through a per-pack fee or other mechanism that will quarantee a price increase of \$1.50 per pack within 3 years, 3 not including existing scheduled Federal, State, and local tax increases, with equivalent price increases on other tobacco products, and should index these price increases by an appropriate measure of inflation. SEC. 319. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS. 8 (a) Congress finds that— 9 (1) studies have found that quality child care, 10 particularly for infants and young children, requires 11 a sensitive, interactive, loving, and consistent care-12 giver; 13 (2) as most parents meet and exceed the criteria 14 described in paragraph (1), circumstances allowing, 15 parental care is the best form of child care; 16 (3) a recent National Institute for Child Health 17 and Development study found that the greatest factor 18 in the development of a young child is "what is hap-19 pening at home and in families"; 20 (4) as a child's interaction with his or her par-21 ents has the most significant impact on the develop-

ment of the child, any Federal child care policy

should enable and encourage parents to spend more

time with their children:

22

23

- 1 (5) nearly ½ of preschool children have at-home 2 mothers and only ⅓ of preschool children have moth-3 ers who are employed full time;
 - (6) a large number of low- and middle-income families sacrifice a second full-time income so that a mother may be at home with her child;
 - (7) the average income of 2-parent families with a single income is \$20,000 less than the average income of 2-parent families with 2 incomes;
 - (8) only 30 percent of preschool children are in families with paid child care and the remaining 70 percent of preschool children are in families that do not pay for child care, many of which are low- to middle-income families struggling to provide child care at home;
 - (9) child care proposals should not provide financial assistance solely to the 30 percent of families that pay for child care and should not discriminate against families in which children are cared for by an at-home parent; and
 - (10) any congressional proposal that increases child care funding should provide financial relief to families that sacrifice an entire income in order that a mother or father may be at home for a young child.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1	(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress
2	that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on
3	the budget assume that—
4	(1) many families in the United States make
5	enormous sacrifices to forego a second income in order
6	to have a parent care for a child at home;
7	(2) there should be no bias against at-home par-
8	ents;
9	(3) parents choose many different forms of child
10	care to meet the needs of their families, such as child
11	care provided by an at-home parent, grandparent,
12	aunt, uncle, neighbor, nanny, preschool, or child care
13	center;
14	(4) any quality child care proposal should in-
15	clude, as a key component, financial relief for those
16	families where there is an at-home parent; and
17	(5) mothers and fathers who have chosen and
18	continue to choose to be at home should be applauded
19	for their efforts.
20	SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING IMMUNITY.
21	It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this reso-
22	lution assume that no immunity will be provided to any
23	tobacco product manufacturer with respect to any health-
24	related civil action commenced by a State or local govern-

1	mental entity or an individual or class of individuals prior
2	to or after the date of the adoption of this resolution.
3	SEC. 321. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING AGRICULTURAL
4	TRADE PROGRAMS.
5	It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals
6	in this concurrent resolution assume the Secretary of Agri-
7	culture will use agricultural trade programs established by
8	law to promote, to the maximum extent practicable, the ex-
9	port of United States agricultural commodities and prod-
10	ucts.
11	SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING LONG-TERM
12	ENTITLEMENT REFORMS.
13	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that the resolution
14	assumes the following—
15	(1) entitlement spending has risen dramatically
16	over the last thirty-five years;
17	(2) in 1963, mandatory spending (i.e. entitle-
18	ment spending and interest on the debt) made up 30
19	percent of the budget, this figure rose to 45 percent by
20	1973, to 56 percent by 1983 and to 61 percent by
21	1993;
22	(3) mandatory spending is expected to make up
23	68 percent of the Federal budget in 1998;
24	(4) absent changes, that spending is expected to
25	take up over 70 percent of the Federal budget shortly

- 1 after the year 2000 and 74 percent of the budget by 2 the year 2008;
- 3 (5) if no action is taken, mandatory spending 4 will consume 100 percent of the budget by the year 5 2030;
- 6 (6) this mandatory spending will continue to 7 crowd out spending for the traditional "discre-8 tionary" functions of Government like clean air and 9 water, a strong National defense, parks and recre-10 ation, education, our transportation system, law en-11 forcement, research and development and other infra-12 structure spending;
 - (7) taking significant steps sooner rather than later to reform entitlement spending will not only boost economic growth in this country, it will also prevent the need for drastic tax and spending decisions in the next century.
- 18 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Sen19 ate that the levels in this budget resolution assume that Con20 gress and the President should work to enact structural re21 forms in entitlement spending in 1998 and beyond which
 22 sufficiently restrain the growth of mandatory spending in
 23 order to keep the budget in balance over the long term, ex24 tend the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare Trust
 25 Funds, avoid crowding out funding for basic Government

14

15

16

1	functions and that every effort should be made to hold man-
2	datory spending to no more than seventy percent of the
3	budget.
4	SEC. 323. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FREEDOM OF
5	HEALTH CARE CHOICE FOR MEDICARE SEN-
6	IORS.
7	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:
8	(1) Medicare beneficiaries should have the same
9	right to obtain health care from the physician or pro-
10	vider of their choice as do Members of Congress and
11	virtually all other Americans.
12	(2) Most seniors are denied this right by current
13	restrictions on their health care choices.
14	(3) Affording seniors this option would create
15	greater health-care choices and result in fewer claims
16	being paid out of the near-bankrupt Medicare trust
17	funds.
18	(4) Legislation to uphold this right of health care
19	choice for seniors must protect beneficiaries and Medi-
20	care from fraud and abuse. Such legislation must in-
21	clude provisions that—
22	(A) require that such contracts providing
23	this right be in writing, be signed by the Medi-
24	care beneficiary, and provide that no claim be

1	submitted to the Health Care Financing Admin-
2	istration;
3	(B) preclude such contracts when the bene-
4	ficiary is experiencing a medical emergency;
5	(C) allow for the Medicare beneficiary to
6	modify or terminate the contract prospectively at
7	any time and to return to Medicare; and
8	(D) are subject to stringent fraud and abuse
9	law, including the Medicare anti-fraud provi-
10	sions in the Health Insurance Portability and
11	Accountability Act of 1996.
12	(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress
13	that seniors have the right to see the physician or health
14	care provider of their choice, and not be limited in such
15	right by the imposition of unreasonable conditions on pro-
16	viders who are willing to treat seniors on a private basis,
17	and that the assumptions underlying the functional totals
18	in this resolution assume that legislation will be enacted
19	to ensure this right.
20	SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REPAIR AND
21	CONSTRUCTION NEEDS OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.
22	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
23	(1) many of our Nation's tribal schools are in a
24	state of serious disrepair. The Bureau of Indian Af-
25	fairs (BIA) operates 187 school facilities nationwide.

- Enrollment in these schools, which presently numbers 47,214 students, has been growing rapidly. A recent General Accounting Office report indicates that the repair backlog in these schools totals \$754,000,000, and that the BIA schools are in generally worse condition than all schools nationally;
 - (2) approximately 60 of these schools are in need of complete replacement or serious renovation. Many of the renovations include basic structural repair for the safety of children, new heating components to keep students warm, and roofing replacement to keep the snow and rain out of the classroom. In addition to failing to provide adequate learning environments for Indian children, these repair and replacement needs pose a serious liability issue for the Federal Government;
 - (3) sixty-three percent of the BIA schools are over 30 years old, and 26 percent are over 50 years old. Approximately 40 percent of all students in BIA schools are in portable classrooms. Originally intended as temporary facilities while tribes awaited new construction funds, these "portables" have a maximum 10 year life-span. Because of the construction backlog, children have been shuffling between class-

- 1 rooms in the harsh climates of the Northern plains 2 and Western States for 10 to 15 years;
- 3 (4) annual appropriations for BIA education fa-4 cilities replacement and repair combined have aver-5 aged \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 annually, meeting 6 only 4 percent of total need. At the present rate, one 7 deteriorating BIA school can be replaced each year. 8 with estimates of completion of nine schools in the 9 next seven years. Since the new construction and re-10 pair backlog is so great and growing, the current 11 focus at BIA construction must remain on emergency 12 and safety needs only, without prioritizing program needs such as increasing enrollment or technology in 13 14 the classroom; and
 - (5) unlike most schools, the BIA schools are a responsibility of the Federal Government. Unfortunately, the failure of the Federal Government to live up to this responsibility has come at the expense of quality education for some of this Nation's poorest children with the fewest existing opportunities to better themselves.
- 22 (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-23 ate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals 24 in this budget resolution assume that the repair and con-25 struction backlog affecting Bureau of Indian Affairs school

16

17

18

19

20

	· -
1	facilities should be eliminated over a period of no more than
2	5 years beginning with fiscal year 1999, and that the Presi-
3	dent should submit to Congress a plan for the orderly elimi-
4	nation of this backlog.
5	SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY
6	PERSONAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS AND THE
7	BUDGET SURPLUS.
8	(a) Findings.—The Senate makes the following find-
9	ings:
10	(1) The Social Security program is the founda-
11	tion of retirement income for most Americans, and
12	solving the financial problems of the Social Security
13	program is a vital national priority and essential for
14	the retirement security of today's working Americans
15	and their families.
16	(2) There is a growing bipartisan consensus that
17	personal retirement accounts should be an important
18	feature of Social Security reform.
19	(3) Personal retirement accounts can provide a
20	substantial retirement nest egg and real personal
21	wealth. For an individual 28 years old on the date
22	of the adoption of this resolution, earning an average
23	wage, and retiring at age 65 in 2035, just 1 percent

of that individual's wages deposited each year in a

personal retirement account and invested in securities

24

- consisting of the Standard & Poors 500 would grow
 to \$132,000, and be worth approximately 20 percent
 of the benefits that would be provided to the individual under the current provisions of the Social Security program.
 - (4) Personal retirement accounts would give the majority of Americans who do not own any investment assets a new stake in the economic growth of America.
 - (5) Personal retirement accounts would demonstrate the value of savings and the magic of compound interest to all Americans. Today, Americans save less than people in almost every other country.
 - (6) Personal retirement accounts would help Americans to better prepare for retirement generally. According to the Congressional Research Service, 60 percent of Americans are not actively participating in a retirement plan other than Social Security, although Social Security was never intended to be the sole source of retirement income.
 - (7) Personal retirement accounts would allow partial prefunding of retirement benefits, thereby providing for Social Security's future financial stability.
- 24 (8) The Federal budget will register a surplus of 25 \$671,000,000,000 over the next 10 years, offering a

1	unique opportunity to begin a permanent solution to
2	Social Security's financing.
3	(9) Using the Federal budget surplus to fund
4	personal retirement accounts would be an important
5	first step in comprehensive Social Security reform
6	and ensuring the delivery of promised retirement ben-
7	efits.
8	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
9	ate that this resolution assumes that the Committee on Fi-
10	nance shall consider and report a legislative proposal this
11	year that would dedicate the Federal budget surplus to the
12	establishment of a program of personal retirement accounts
13	for working Americans and reduce the unfunded liabilities
14	of the Social Security program.
15	SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ELIMI-
16	NATION OF THE MARRIAGE PENALTY.
17	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:
18	(1) Marriage is the foundation of the American
19	society and the key institution preserving our values.
20	(2) The tax code should not penalize those who
21	choose to marry.
22	(3) However, the Congressional Budget Office
23	found that 42 percent of married couples face a mar-
24	riage penalty under the current tax system.

1	(4) The Congressional Budget Office found that
2	the average penalty amounts to \$1,380 a year.
3	(5) This penalty is one of the factors behind the
4	decline of marriage.
5	(6) In 1970, just 0.5 percent of the couples in the
6	United States were unmarried. By 1996, this percent-
7	age had risen to 7.2 percent.
8	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
9	ate that the provisions in this budget resolution assume that
10	the Congress shall begin to phase out the marriage penalty
11	this year.
12	SEC. 327. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING
13	AFFORDABLE, HIGH-QUALITY HEALTH CARE
14	FOR SENIORS.
15	(a) Findings.—Congress finds the following:
16	(1) Seniors deserve affordable, high quality
17	health care.
18	(2) The Medicare program under title XVIII of
19	the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) has
20	made health care affordable for millions of seniors.
21	(3) Beneficiaries under the Medicare program
22	deserve to know that such program will cover the ben-
23	efits that they are currently entitled to.

1	(4) Beneficiaries under the Medicare program
2	can pay out-of-pocket for health care services when-
3	ever they—
4	(A) do not want a claim for reimbursement
5	for such services submitted to such program; or
6	(B) want or need to obtain health care serv-
7	ices that such program does not cover.
8	(5) Beneficiaries under the Medicare program
9	can use doctors who do not receive any reimbursement
10	under such program.
11	(6) Close to 75 percent of seniors have annual
12	incomes below \$25,000, including 4 percent who have
13	annual incomes below \$5,000, making any additional
14	out-of-pocket costs for health care services extremely
15	burden some.
16	(7) Very few beneficiaries under the Medicare
17	program report having difficulty obtaining access to
18	a physician who accepts reimbursement under such
19	program.
20	(b) Sense of Congress.—It is the sense of Congress
21	that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in
22	this resolution assume that seniors have the right to afford-
23	able, high-quality health care, that they have the right to
24	choose their physicians, and that no change should be made
25	to the Medicare program that could—

1	(1) impose unreasonable and unpredictable out-
2	of-pocket costs for seniors or erode the benefits that the
3	38,000,000 beneficiaries under the Medicare program
4	are entitled to;
5	(2) compromise the efforts of the Secretary of
6	Health and Human Services to screen inappropriate
7	or fraudulent claims for reimbursement under such
8	program; and
9	(3) allow unscrupulous providers under such
10	program to bill twice for the same services.
11	SEC. 328. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PERMANENT
12	EXTENSION OF INCOME AVERAGING FOR
13	FARMERS.
14	It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this
15	resolution assume that if the revenue levels are reduced pur-
16	suant to section 201 of this resolution for tax legislation,
17	such amount as is necessary shall be used to permanently
18	extend income averaging for farmers for purposes of the In-
19	ternal Revenue Code of 1986.
20	SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE TO MAINTAIN FULL FUND-
21	
21	ING FOR THE SECTION 202 ELDERLY HOUS-
21	ING FOR THE SECTION 202 ELDERLY HOUS- ING PROGRAM.
22	ING PROGRAM.

- income Americans, providing both affordable low-in come housing and supportive services designed to meet
 the special needs of the elderly.
 - (2) Since 1959, the Section 202 Elderly Housing program has funded some 5,400 elderly housing projects with over 330,000 housing units, with the current average tenant in Section 202 housing being a frail, older woman in her seventies, living alone with an income of less than \$10,000 per year.
 - (3) The combination of affordable housing and supportive services under the Section 202 Elderly Housing program is critical to promoting independent living, self-sufficiency, and dignity for the elderly while delaying more costly institutional care.
 - (4) There are over 1.4 million elderly Americans currently identified as having "worst case housing needs" and in need of affordable housing.
 - (5) There are 33 million Americans aged 65 and over, some 13 percent of all Americans. The number of elderly Americans is anticipated to grow to over 69 million by the year 2030, which would be some 20 percent of all Americans, and continue to increase to almost 80 million by 2050.
 - (6) The President's Budget Request for fiscal year 1999 proposes reducing funding for the Section

- 2 202 Elderly Housing program from the fiscal year 2 1998 level of \$645,000,000 to \$109,000,000 in fiscal 3 year 1999. This represents a reduction of over 83 per-4 cent in funding, which will result in reducing the 5 construction of Section 202 housing units from some 6 6,000 units in fiscal year 1998 to only 1,500 units in 7 fiscal year 1999.
- 8 (7) The full funding of the Section 202 Elderly
 9 Housing program as an independent Federal housing
 10 program is an investment in our elderly citizens as
 11 well as our Nation.
- 12 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Sen13 ate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Section
 14 202 Elderly Housing program, as provided under section
 15 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, shall be funded
 16 in fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 at not
 17 less than the fiscal year 1998 funding level of \$645,000,000.
- 18 SEC. 330. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING OUTLAY ESTI-
- 19 MATES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
- **BUDGET.**
- 21 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following find-22 ings:
- 23 (1) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 created a 24 new era for Federal spending and forced the Depart-

- ment of Defense to plan on limited spending over the
 five-year period from fiscal year 1998 through 2002.
 - (2) The agreements forged under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 specifically defined the available amounts of budget authority and outlays, requiring the Department of Defense to properly plan its future activities in the new, constrained budget environment.
 - (3) The Department of Defense worked with the Office of Management and Budget to develop a fiscal year 1999 budget which complies with the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.
 - (4) Based on Department of Defense program plans and policy changes, the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Defense made detailed estimates of fiscal year 1999 Department of Defense outlay rates to ensure that the budget submitted would comply with the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.
 - (5) The Congressional Budget Office outlay estimate of the fiscal year 1999 Department of Defense budget request exceeds both the outlay limit imposed by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and the Office of Management and Budget's outlay estimate, a disagreement which would force a total restructuring of the Department of Defense's fiscal year 1999 budget.

- 1 (6) The restructuring imposed on the Depart-2 ment of Defense would have a devastating impact on 3 readiness, troop morale, military quality of life, and 4 ongoing procurement and development programs.
 - (7) The restructuring of the budget would be driven solely by differing statistical estimates made by capable parties.
 - (8) In a letter currently under review, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget will identify multiple differences between the Office of Management and Budget's estimated outlay rates and the Congressional Budget Office's estimated outlay rates.
 - (9) New information on Department of Defense policy changes and program execution plans now permit the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office to reevaluate their initial projections of fiscal year 1999 outlay rates.
- 18 (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen19 ate that the totals underlying this concurrent resolution on
 20 the budget assume that not later than April 22, 1998, the
 21 Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Sec22 retary of Defense, and the Director of the Congressional
 23 Budget Office shall complete discussions and develop a com24 mon estimate of the projected fiscal year 1999 outlay rates
 25 for Department of Defense accounts.

1	SEC. 331. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING OUTLAY ESTI-
2	MATES FOR THE BUDGETS OF FEDERAL
3	AGENCIES OTHER THAN THE DEPARTMENT
4	OF DEFENSE.
5	(a) Findings.—The Senate makes the following find-
6	ings:
7	(1) The Federal civilian workforce in non-De-
8	fense Department agencies shrank by 125,000 employ-
9	ees, or 10 percent, between 1992 and 1997.
10	(2) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 assumed
11	over \$60,000,000,000 in reductions in nondefense dis-
12	cretionary spending over the period 1998–2002.
13	(3) These reductions were agreed to notwith-
14	standing ever-increasing responsibilities in agencies
15	engaged in fighting crime, combating the drug war,
16	countering terrorist threats, cleaning the environment,
17	enforcing the law, improving education, conducting
18	health research, conducting energy research and devel-
19	opment, enhancing the Nation's physical infrastruc-
20	ture, and providing veterans programs.
21	(4) All Federal agencies have worked closely with
22	the Office of Management and Budget to balance
23	much-needed programmatic needs with fiscal pru-
24	dence and to submit budget requests for fiscal year
25	1999 that comply with the Balanced Budget Act of
26	1997.

- 1 (5) Reductions in the President's requests, as es-2 timated by the Office of Management and Budget, to 3 comply with the Congressional Budget Office's esti-4 mates could seriously jeopardize priority domestic 5 discretionary programs.
 - (6) There is no mechanism through which the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget identify their differences in outlay rates for nondefense agencies.
- 10 (7) Such consultation would lead to greater un-11 derstanding between the two agencies and potentially 12 fewer and/or smaller differences in the future.
- 13 (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen14 ate that the totals underlying this concurrent resolution on
 15 the budget assume that not later than April 22, 1998, the
 16 Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the
 17 Director of the Congressional Budget Office, in consultation
 18 with the Secretaries of the affected nondefense agencies, shall
 19 complete discussions and develop a common estimate of the
 20 projected fiscal year 1999 outlay rates for accounts in non21 defense agencies.

7

8

1	SEC. 332. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AN EVALUA-
2	TION OF THE OUTCOME OF WELFARE RE-
3	FORM.
4	It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels
5	in this resolution assume that—
6	(1) the Secretary of Health and Human Services
7	will, as part of the annual report to Congress under
8	section 411 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C.
9	611), include data regarding the rate of employment,
10	job retention, and earnings characteristics of former
11	recipients of assistance under the State programs
12	funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security
13	Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) for each such State pro-
14	gram; and
15	(2) for purposes of the annual report for fiscal
16	year 1997, the information described in paragraph
17	(1) will be transmitted to Congress not later than
18	September 1, 1998.
19	SEC. 333. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ESTAB-
20	LISHMENT OF A NATIONAL BACKGROUND
21	CHECK SYSTEM FOR LONG-TERM CARE WORK-
22	ERS.
23	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following find-
24	ings:
25	(1) The impending retirement of the baby boom
26	generation will greatly increase the demand and need

- for quality long-term care and it is incumbent on Congress and the President to ensure that Medicare and Medicaid patients are protected from abuse, neglect, and mistreatment.
 - (2) Although the majority of long-term care facilities do an excellent job in caring for elderly and disabled patients, incidents of abuse and neglect and mistreatment do occur at an unacceptable rate and are not limited to nursing homes alone.
- 10 (3) Current Federal and State safeguards are in-11 adequate because there is little or no information 12 sharing between States about known abusers and no 13 common State procedures for tracking abusers from 14 State to State and facility to facility.
- 15 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Sen16 ate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals
 17 in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that a
 18 national registry of abusive long-term care workers should
 19 be established by building upon existing infrastructures at
 20 the Federal and State levels that would enable long-term
 21 care providers who participate in the Medicare and Medic22 aid programs (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.; 1396 et seq.) to con23 duct background checks on prospective employees.

6

7

8

1	SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EXPANDING MEDI-
2	CARE BENEFITS.
3	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:
4	(1) In the 1997 Balanced Budget Agreement,
5	changes were made to Medicare that extended the sol-
6	vency of the Trust Fund for 10 years.
7	(2) The Medicare Commission, also established
8	in the Balanced Budget Agreement, has just started
9	the task of examining the Medicare program in an ef-
10	fort to make sound policy recommendations to Con-
11	gress and the Administration about what needs to be
12	done to ensure that Medicare is financially prepared
13	to handle the added burden when the baby boomers
14	begin retiring.
15	(3) The problems facing Medicare are not about
16	more revenues. The program needs to do more to im-
17	prove the health care status of retirees and give them
18	more choices and better information to make wise
19	consumer decisions when purchasing health care serv-
20	ices.
21	(4) Improving the health care status of senior
22	citizens would ensure additional savings for Medicare.
23	Helping seniors stay healthier should be a priority of
24	any legislation aimed at protecting Medicare.
25	(5) In order to keep seniors healthier, Medicare
26	has to become more prevention based. Currently,

1	Medicare offers prevention benefits, and the Balanced
2	Budget Act of 1997 made a substantial investment in
3	prevention benefits, providing \$8,500,000,000 over 10
4	years.
5	(6) Preventing illnesses or long hospital stays or
6	repeated hospital stays will save Medicare dollars.
7	(7) Medicare cannot be saved without structural
8	changes and reforms.
9	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
10	ate that the functional totals underlying this resolution as-
11	sume that the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 directed the
12	National Bipartisan Commission on the future of Medicare
13	to examine Medicare's benefit structure, including preven-
14	tion benefits, and make recommendations to the Congress
15	on such benefits in the context of an overall plan to extend
16	the solvency of the program.
17	SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BATTLEFIELD PRESER-
18	VATION.
19	It is the sense of the Senate that the budget levels in
20	this resolution assume that—
21	(1) preserving Revolutionary War, War of 1812,
22	and Civil War battlefields is an integral part of pre-
23	serving our Nation's history;
24	(2) the Secretary of the Interior should give spe-
25	cial priority to the preservation of Revolutionary War

- and War of 1812 battlefields, by making funds available for the conduct of the Revolutionary War and War of 1812 Historic Preservation Study as authorized by section 603 of Public Law 104–333 (16 U.S.C. 1a–5 note); and
- 6 (3) the Secretary of the Interior should give spe7 cial priority to the preservation of Revolutionary
 8 War, War of 1812, and Civil War battlefields by allo9 cating funds in the Land and Water Conservation
 10 Fund for the purchase of battlefield sites the integrity
 11 of which is threatened by urban or suburban develop12 ment.

13 SEC. 336. A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE SENATE'S SUP-

- 14 PORT FOR FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAW
- 15 ENFORCEMENT.
- 16 (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
- 17 (1) our Federal, State and local law enforcement 18 officers provide essential services that preserve and 19 protect our freedom and safety, and with the support 20 of Federal assistance, State and local law enforcement 21 officers have succeeded in reducing the national 22 scourge of violent crime, illustrated by a murder rate 23 in 1996 which is projected to be the lowest since 1971 24 and a violent crime total in 1996 which is the lowest 25 since 1990:

- (2) through a comprehensive effort to attack vio-lence against women mounted by State and local law enforcement, and dedicated volunteers and profes-sionals who provide victim services, shelter, counsel-ing and advocacy to battered women and their chil-dren, important strides have been made against the national scourge of violence against women, illus-trated by the decline in the murder rate for wives, exwives and girlfriends at the hands of their "inti-mates" fell to a 19-year low in 1995;
 - (3) recent gains by Federal, State and local law enforcement in the fight against violent crime and violence against women are fragile, and continued financial commitment from the Federal Government for funding and financial assistance is required to sustain and build upon these gains; and
 - (4) the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund as adopted by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 funds the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 without adding to the Federal budget deficit.
- 24 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Sen-25 ate that the provisions and the functional totals underlying

1	this resolution assume the Federal Government's commit-
2	ment to fund Federal law enforcement programs and pro-
3	grams to assist State and local efforts to combat violent
4	crime, including violence against women, shall be main-
5	tained and funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust
6	Fund shall continue to at least fiscal year 2003.
7	SEC. 337. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANALYSIS OF CIVILIAN
8	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN
9	THE FEDERAL BUDGET.
10	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:
11	(1) The National Academy of Sciences, National
12	Academy of Engineering, and Institute of Medicine
13	have recommended, in their 1995 report, entitled "Al-
14	locating Federal Funds for Science and Technology",
15	that the Federal science and technology budget "be
16	presented as a comprehensive whole in the President's
17	budget and similarly considered as a whole at the be-
18	ginning of the congressional budget process before the
19	total Federal budget is disaggregated and sent to the
20	appropriations committees and subcommittees".
21	(2) Civilian Federal agencies are supporting
22	more than \$35,000,000,000 of research and develop-
23	ment in fiscal year 1998, but it is difficult for the

Congress and the public to track or understand this

- support because it is dispersed among 12 different
 budget functions.
- (3) A meaningful examination of the overall 3 Federal budget for science and technology, consistent with the recommendation of the National Academies, 5 6 as well as an examination of science and technology budgets in individual civilian agencies, would be fa-7 8 cilitated if the President's budget request clearly dis-9 played the amounts requested for science and tech-10 nology programs across all civilian agencies and clas-11 sified these amounts in Budget Function 250.
- 12 (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen13 ate that the congressional budget for the United States for
 14 fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 should con15 solidate the spending for all Federal civilian science and
 16 technology programs in Budget Function 250, and that the
 17 President should accordingly transmit to the Congress a
 18 budget request for fiscal year 2000 that classifies these pro-
- 19 grams, across all Federal civilian departments and agen-
- 20 cies, in Budget Function 250.
- 21 SEC. 338. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CIVILIAN SCIENCE
- 22 AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS IN THE FED-
- 23 ERAL BUDGET.
- It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions un-
- 25 derlying the function totals in this budget resolution assume

1	that expenditures for civilian science and technology pro-
2	grams in the Federal budget will double over the period
3	from fiscal year 1998 to fiscal year 2008.
4	SEC. 339. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LONG-TERM BUDGET-
5	ING AND REPAYMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT.
6	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
7	(1) today, there are 34,000,000 Americans over
8	the age of 65, and by the year 2030, that number will
9	grow to nearly 70,000,000;
10	(2) in 1963, mandatory spending represented 30
11	percent of the Federal budget, while discretionary
12	spending made up 70 percent, and by 1998, those
13	proportions have almost completely reversed, in that
14	mandatory spending now accounts for 68 percent of
15	the Federal budget, while discretionary spending rep-
16	resents 32 percent;
17	(3) according to the 1997 Annual Report of the
18	Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Sur-
19	vivors Insurance and Disability Insurance (OASDI)
20	Trust Fund—
21	(A) the difference between the income and
22	benefits for the OASDI program is a deficit of
23	2.23 percent of taxable payroll;

1	(B) the assets in the Trust Fund are ex-
2	pected to be depleted under present law in the
3	year 2029;
4	(C) by the time the assets in the Trust Fund
5	are depleted, annual tax revenues will be suffi-
6	cient to cover only three-fourths of the annual ex-
7	penditures;
8	(D) intermediate estimates are that OASDI
9	will absorb nearly 17.5 percent of national pay-
10	roll by the year 2030; and
11	(E) the cost of the OASDI program is esti-
12	mated to rise from its current level of 4.7 percent
13	of Gross Domestic Product to 6.7 percent by the
14	end of the 75-year projection period;
15	(4) according to reports by the Congressional
16	Budget Office, the Economic and Budget Outlook:
17	Fiscal Years 1999-2008 (January 1998) and Reduc-
18	ing the Deficit: Spending and Revenue Options
19	(March 1997)—
20	(A) the Medicare Part A Trust Fund will be
21	exhausted early in fiscal year 2010;
22	(B) enrollment in Medicare will increase
23	dramatically as the baby boomers reach age 65;
24	(C) between the years 2010 and 2030, en-
25	rollment in Medicare is projected to grow by 2.4

1	percent per year, up from the 1.4 percent aver-
2	age annual growth projected through 2007;
3	(D) by the year 2030, Medicare enrollment
4	will have doubled, to 75,000,000 people; and
5	(E) the increase in Medicare enrollment
6	caused by the aging of the population will be ac-
7	companied by a tapering of the growth rate of
8	the working age population, and the number of
9	workers will drop from 3.8 for every Medicare
10	beneficiary in 1997 to 2.02 per beneficiary by
11	2030;
12	(5) the demographic shift that is currently tak-
13	ing place, and will continue for the next 30 years,
14	will put a tremendous burden on workers as the cost
15	of programs such as Social Security and Medicare
16	are borne by proportionately fewer workers;
17	(6) the current Budget Resolution, which projects
18	revenues and spending only for the next 10 years,
19	does not give Congress a clear picture of the budget
20	problems that confront the United States shortly after
21	the turn of the century;
22	(7) currently, 14 percent of the Federal budget is
23	spent on interest payments on the national debt; and
24	(8) if projected surpluses are used entirely for
25	debt reduction and current tax and spending policies

- 1 remain unchanged, the share of Federal income need-2 ed to pay interest would drop below 5 percent within
- 3 12 years, and in 1997, that 10 percentage-point re-
- 4 duction would have amounted to \$158,000,000,000
- 5 available for other priorities.
- 6 (b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
- 7 ate that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution
- 8 assume that future budget resolutions and future budgets
- 9 submitted by the President should include—
- 10 (1) an analysis for the period of 30 fiscal years
- beginning with such fiscal year, of the estimated levels
- of total budget outlays and total new budget author-
- ity, the estimated revenues to be received, the esti-
- 14 mated surplus or deficit, if any, for each major Fed-
- eral entitlement program for each fiscal year in such
- 16 period; and
- 17 (2) a specific accounting of payments, if any,
- made to reduce the public debt, or unfunded liabilities
- 19 associated with each major Federal entitlement pro-
- *gram.*
- 21 SEC. 340. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PRESIDENT'S
- 22 **BUDGET.**
- It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels
- 24 in this resolution assume that the President should submit.
- 25 as part of the budget request of the President that is submit-

1	ted to Congress, a study of the impact of the provisions of
2	the budget on each generation of Americans and its long-
3	term effects on each generation.
4	SEC. 341. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE VALUE
5	OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM FOR FU
6	TURE RETIREES.
7	(a) Findings.—The Senate makes the following find-
8	ings:
9	(1) The Social Security system has allowed a
10	generation of Americans to retire with dignity.
11	Today, 13 percent of the population is 65 or older
12	and by 2030, 20 percent of the population will be 63
13	or older. More than ½ of the elderly do not receive
14	private pensions and more than ½ have no income
15	from assets.
16	(2) For 60 percent of all senior citizens, Social
17	Security benefits provide almost 80 percent of their
18	retirement income. For 80 percent of all senior citi-
19	zens, Social Security benefits provide over 50 percent
20	of their retirement income.
21	(3) Poverty rates among the elderly are at the
22	lowest level since the United States began to keep pov-
23	erty statistics, due in large part to the Social Secu-

rity system.

- (4) 78 percent of Americans pay more in payroll
 taxes than they do in income taxes.
- 3 (5) According to the 1997 report of the Manag-4 ing Trustee for the Social Security trust funds, the 5 accumulated balance in the Federal Old-Age and Sur-6 vivors Insurance Trust Fund is estimated to fall to 7 zero by 2029, and the estimated payroll tax at that 8 time will be sufficient to cover only 75 percent of the 9 benefits owed to retirees at that time.
- 10 (6) The average American retiring in the year 11 2015 will pay \$250,000 in payroll taxes over the 12 course of a working career.
- 13 (7) Future generations of Americans must be 14 guaranteed the same value from the Social Security 15 system as past covered recipients.
- 16 (b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Sen17 ate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that
 18 no change in the Social Security system should be made
 19 that would reduce the value of the Social Security system
 20 for future generations of retirees.
- 21 SEC. 342. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE LAND AND WATER
 22 CONSERVATION FUND.
- It is the sense of the Senate that the budget levels in 24 this resolution assume that programs funded from the Land

1	and Water Conservation Fund should be funded in the full
2	amount authorized by law.
3	SEC. 343. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EDUCATION GOALS.
4	It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals
5	underlying this resolution assume that the Federal Govern-
6	ment should work hand-in-hand with States, school dis-
7	tricts, and local leaders—
8	(1) to accomplish the following goals by the year
9	2005:
10	(A) establish achievement levels and assess-
11	ments in every grade for the core academic cur-
12	riculum; measure each regular student's perform-
13	ance; and prohibit the practice of social pro-
14	motion of students (promoting students routinely
15	from one grade to the next without regard to
16	$their\ a cademic\ a chievement);$
17	(B) provide remedial programs for students
18	whose achievement levels indicate they should not
19	be promoted to the next grade;
20	(C) create smaller schools to enable students
21	to have closer interaction with teachers;
22	(D) require at least 180 days per year of
23	instruction in core curriculum subjects;
24	(E) recruit new teachers who are adequately
25	trained and credentialed in the subject or sub-

1	jects they teach and encourage excellent, experi-
2	enced teachers to remain in the classroom by
3	providing adequate salaries; require all teachers
4	to be credentialed and limit emergency or tem-
5	porary teaching credentials to a limited period
6	of time; hold teachers and principals accountable
7	to high educational standards; and
8	(F) require all regular students to pass an
9	examination in basic core curriculum subjects in
10	order to receive a high school diploma; and
11	(2) to reaffirm the importance of public school-
12	ing and commit to guaranteeing excellence and ac-
13	countability in the public schools of this Nation.
14	SEC. 344. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF THE SENATE.
15	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
16	(1) while it is important to study the effects of
17	class size on learning and study the need to hire more
18	teachers, each type of study must be carried out in
19	conjunction with an effort to ensure that there will be
20	quality teachers in every classroom;
21	(2) all children deserve well-educated teachers;
22	(3) there is a teacher quality crisis in the United
23	States;
24	(4) individuals entering a classroom as teachers
25	should have a sound grasp on the subject the individ-

1	uals intend to teach, and the individuals should know
2	how to teach;
3	(5) less than 40 percent of the individuals teach-
4	ing core subjects (consisting of English, mathematics,
5	science, social studies, and foreign languages) majored
6	or minored in the core subjects;
7	(6) the quality of teachers impacts student
8	achievement;
9	(7) the measure of a good teacher is how much
10	and how well the teacher's students learn;
11	(8) teachers should have the opportunity to learn
12	new technology and teaching methods through the es-
13	tablishment of teacher training facilities so that
14	teachers can share their new knowledge and experi-
15	ences with children in the classroom;
16	(9) school officials should have the flexibility the
17	officials need to have teachers in their schools ade-
18	quately trained to meet strenuous teacher standards;
19	(10) knowledgeable and eager individuals of
20	sound character and various professional backgrounds
21	should be encouraged to enter kindergarten through
22	grade 12 classrooms as teachers; and
23	(11) States should have maximum flexibility and
24	incentives to create alternative teacher certification

1	and licensure programs in order to recruit well-edu-
2	cated people into the teaching profession.
3	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
4	ate that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution
5	on the budget assume—
6	(1) the enactment of legislation to provide assist-
7	ance for programs that—
8	(A) focus on teacher training delivered
9	through local partnerships, with private and
10	public partners, to ensure that current and fu-
11	ture teachers possess necessary teaching skills
12	and knowledge of subject areas; and
13	(B) focus on alternative certification to re-
14	cruit knowledgeable and eager individuals of
15	sound character to enter kindergarten through
16	grade 12 classrooms as teachers;
17	(2) that the quality of teachers can be strength-
18	ened by improving the academic knowledge of teachers
19	in the subject areas in which the teachers teach;
20	(3) that institutions of higher education should
21	be held accountable to prepare teachers who are highly
22	competent in the subject areas in which the teachers
23	teach, including preparing teachers by providing
24	training in the effective uses of technologies in class-
25	rooms; and

1	(4) that there should be recruitment into teach-
2	ing of high quality individuals, including individuals
3	from other occupations.
4	SEC. 345. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INS CIRCUIT RIDERS
5	IN THE FORMER SOVIET UNION.
6	It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this
7	resolution assume that included in the funding for the Im-
8	migration and Naturalization Service (INS) is \$2,000,000
9	for the establishment of INS circuit riders in the former
10	Soviet Union for the purpose of processing refugees and con-
11	ducting medical examinations of refugees who will enter the
12	United States under the Refugee Act of 1980.
13	SEC. 346. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING
14	FOR THE AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.
15	It is the sense of the Senate that the congressional
16	budget for the United States Government as provided for
17	in this resolution should assure that—
18	(1) the contract authority level for the Airport
19	Improvement Program (provided for in part B of sub-
20	
20	title VII of title 49, United States Code) not be re-
21	title VII of title 49, United States Code) not be reduced below the current level of \$2,347,000,000; and
21	duced below the current level of \$2,347,000,000; and

1	SEC. 347. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE ONE HUNDRED
2	FIFTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION SHOULD
3	REAUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE FARMLAND
4	PROTECTION PROGRAM.
5	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following find-
6	ings—
7	(1) eighteen States and dozens of localities have
8	spent nearly \$1,000,000,000 to protect over 600,000
9	acres of important farmland;
10	(2) the Farmland Protection Program has pro-
11	vided cost-sharing for 18 States and dozens of local-
12	ities to protect over 82,000 acres on 230 farms since
13	1996;
14	(3) the Farmland Protection Program has gen-
15	erated new interest in saving farmland in commu-
16	nities around the country;
17	(4) the Farmland Protection Program represents
18	an innovative and voluntary partnership, rewards
19	local ingenuity, and supports local priorities;
20	(5) current funds authorized for the Farmland
21	Protection Program will be exhausted in the next six
22	months;
23	(6) the United States is losing two acres of our
24	best farmland to development every minute of every
25	day;

1	(7) these lands produce three quarters of the
2	fruits and vegetables and over one half of the dairy
3	in the United States.
4	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
5	ate that the functional totals contained in this resolution
6	assume that the One Hundred Fifth Congress, Second Ses-
7	sion will reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection
8	Program.
9	SEC. 348. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON HEALTH CARE QUAL-
10	ITY.
11	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following find-
12	ings—
13	(1) out of a total 549 plans under the Federal
14	Employees Health Benefits Program, which includes
15	fee-for-service, point of service, and Health Mainte-
16	nance Organizations, only 186 were fully accredited;
17	(2) out of a total 549 plans under the Federal
18	Employees Health Benefits Program, which includes
19	fee-for-service, point of service, and Health Mainte-
20	nance Organizations, 7 were denied accreditation.
21	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
22	ate that the assumptions underlying this resolution provide
23	for the enactment of legislation requiring all health plans
24	participating in the Federal Employees Health Benefits
25	Program to be accredited by a nationally recognized accred-

1	itation organization representative of a spectrum of health
2	care interests including purchasers, consumers, providers
3	and health plans.
4	SEC. 349. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING WASTEFUL
5	SPENDING IN DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ACQUI-
6	SITION PRACTICES.
7	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
8	(1) according to the Defense Department's In-
9	spector General, despite efforts to streamline Govern-
10	ment purchases, the military, in some cases, paid
11	more than "fair value" for many items;
12	(2) efficient purchasing policies, in the context of
13	decreasing defense budgets, are more important than
14	ever to ensure Defense Department spending contrib-
15	utes to military readiness.
16	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
17	ate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the
18	Defense Department should continue efforts to eliminate
19	wasteful spending such that defense spending allocated in
20	the fiscal year 1999 budget, and all subsequent budgets, is
21	spent in the manner most efficient to maintain and pro-
22	mote military readiness for United States Armed Forces
23	around the globe.

1	SEC. 350. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE UNITED
2	STATES RESPONSE TO THE CHANGING NA-
3	TURE OF TERRORISM.
4	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
5	(1) the threat of terrorism to American citizens
6	and interests remains high, with Americans suffering
7	one-third of the total terrorist attacks in the world in
8	1997;
9	(2) the terrorist threat is changing—while past
10	acts were generally limited to the use of conventional
11	explosives and weapons, terrorists today are exploit-
12	ing technological advances and increasingly lethal
13	tools and strategies to pursue their agenda;
14	(3) on a worldwide basis, terrorists are focusing
15	on afflicting mass casualties on civilian targets
16	through the acquisition of chemical, biological and
17	nuclear weapons of mass destruction;
18	(4) chemical and biological weapons in the
19	hands of terrorists or rogue nations constitute a
20	threat to the United States;
21	(5) the multifaceted nature of the terrorist threat
22	encompasses not only foreign terrorists targeting
23	American citizens and interests abroad, but foreign
24	terrorists operating within the United States itself, as
25	well as domestic terrorists;

- (6) terrorists groups are becoming increasingly
 multinational, more associated with criminal activity, and less responsive to external influences;
 - (7) terrorists exploit America's free and open society to illegally enter the country, raise funds, recruit new members, spread propaganda, and plan future activities;
 - (8) terrorists are also making use of computer technology to communicate, solicit money and support, and store information essential to their operations;
 - (9) State sponsors of terrorism and other foreign countries are known to be developing computer intrusion and manipulation capabilities which could pose a threat to essential public and private information systems in the United States;
 - (10) the infrastructures deemed critical to the United States are the telecommunications networks, the electric power grid, oil and gas distribution, water distribution facilities, transportation systems, financial networks, emergency services, and the continuity of Government services, the disruption of which could result in significant losses to the United States economic well-being, public welfare, or national security;

1	(11) a national strategy of infrastructure protec-
2	tion, as required by the Defense Appropriations Act
3	of 1996, and subsequent amendments, has yet to be
4	issued; and
5	(12) we as a Nation remain fundamentally un-
6	prepared to respond in a coordinated and effective
7	manner to these growing terrorist threats.
8	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
9	ate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—
10	(1) the Federal Government must take the lead
11	in establishing effective coordination between intel-
12	ligence-gathering and law enforcement agencies,
13	among Federal, State, and local levels of Government,
14	and with the private sector, for the purpose of assess-
15	ing, warning, and protecting against terrorist at-
16	tacks;
17	(2) technical preparedness for the detection and
18	analysis of chemical and biological weapons, and for
19	swift and adequate emergency response to their use by
20	terrorists, must be a near-term continuing priority;
21	(3) the United States must seek full inter-
22	national cooperation in securing the capture and con-
23	viction of terrorists who attack or pose a threat to
24	American citizens and interests;

1	(4) the United States should fully enforce its
2	laws intended to deny foreign terrorist organizations
3	the ability to raise money in the United States, pre-
4	vent the evasion of our immigration laws and further-
5	ing of criminal activities, and curtail the use of our
6	country as a base of operations; and
7	(5) a national strategy, adequate to addressing
8	the complexity of protecting our critical infrastruc-
9	tures, and as required by the Defense Appropriations
10	Act of 1996 and subsequent amendments, must be
11	completed and implemented immediately.
12	SEC. 351. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ECONOMIC GROWTH,
13	SOCIAL SECURITY, AND GOVERNMENT EFFI-
13 14	SOCIAL SECURITY, AND GOVERNMENT EFFI- CIENCY.
14	CIENCY.
14 15	CIENCY. It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals
141516	CIENCY. It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that—
14151617	CIENCY. It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that— (1) the elimination of a discretionary spending
14 15 16 17 18	CIENCY. It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that— (1) the elimination of a discretionary spending program may be used for either tax cuts or to reform
14 15 16 17 18 19	CIENCY. It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that— (1) the elimination of a discretionary spending program may be used for either tax cuts or to reform the Social Security system;
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CIENCY. It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that— (1) the elimination of a discretionary spending program may be used for either tax cuts or to reform the Social Security system; (2) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CIENCY. It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that— (1) the elimination of a discretionary spending program may be used for either tax cuts or to reform the Social Security system; (2) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act

1	SEC. 352. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A SUPER-
2	MAJORITY REQUIREMENT FOR RAISING
3	TAXES.
4	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
5	(1) the Nation's current tax system is indefensi-
6	ble, being overly complex, burdensome, and severely
7	limiting to economic opportunity for all Americans;
8	(2) fundamental tax reform should be undertaken
9	as soon as practicable to produce a tax system that—
10	(A) applies a low tax rate, through easily
11	understood laws, to all Americans;
12	(B) provides tax relief for working Ameri-
13	cans;
14	(C) protects the rights of taxpayers and re-
15	duces tax collection abuses;
16	(D) eliminates the bias against savings and
17	investment;
18	(E) promotes economic growth and job cre-
19	ation;
20	(F) does not penalize marriage or families;
21	and
22	(G) provides for a taxpayer-friendly collec-
23	tions process to replace the Internal Revenue
24	Service; and
25	(3) the stability and longevity of any new tax
26	system designed to achieve these goals should be guar-

1	anteed with a supermajority vote requirement so that
2	Congress cannot easily raise tax rates, impose neu
3	taxes, or otherwise increase the amount of a tax-
4	payer's income that is subject to tax.
5	(b) Sense of Senate.—It is the sense of Senate than
6	the assumptions underlying the functional totals of this res-
7	olution assume fundamental tax reform that is accom-
8	panied by a proposal to amend the Constitution of the
9	United States to require a supermajority vote in each House
10	of Congress to approve tax increases.
11	SEC. 353. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON HEALTH CARE QUAL
12	ITY.
13	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following find-
14	ings:
15	(1) Rapid changes in the health care marketplace
16	have compromised confidence in the our Nation's
17	health system.
18	(2) American consumers want more convenience,
19	fewer hassles, more choices, and better service from
20	their health insurance plans.
21	(3) All Americans deserve quality-driven health
22	care supported by sound science and evidence-based
23	medicine.
24	(4) The Federal Government, through the Na-
25	tional Institutes of Health supports research that im-

- 1 proves the quality of medical care that Americans re-2 ceive.
- 3 (5) This resolution assumes increased funding 4 for the National Institutes of Health for 1999 of 5 \$15,100,000,000, an 11-percent increase over current 6 funding levels, which are 7 percent higher than in 7 1997.
 - (6) As the largest purchaser of health care services, the Federal Government has a responsibility to utilize its purchasing power to demand high quality health plans and providers for its health programs and to protect its beneficiaries from inferior medical care.
 - (7) The Federal Government must adopt the posture of private sector purchasers and insist on high quality care for the 67,000,000 Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries and the 9,000,000 Federal employees, retirees, and their dependents.
 - (8) The private sector has proven to be more capable of keeping pace with the rapid changes in health care delivery and medical practice that affect quality of care considerations than the Federal Government.
- (9) As Congress considers health care legislation,
 it must first commit to "do no harm" to health care

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- 1 quality, consumers, and the evolving market place.
- 2 Rushing to legislate or regulate based on anecdotal in-
- 3 formation and micro-managing health plans on po-
- 4 litically popular issues will not solve the problems of
- 5 consumer confidence and the quality of our health
- 6 care system.

persons.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 7 (10) When health insurance premiums rise, 8 Americans lose health coverage. Studies indicate that 9 a 1 percent increase in private health insurance pre-10 miums will be associated with an increase in the 11 number of persons without insurance of about 400,000
 - (11) Health care costs have begun to rise significantly in the past year. The Congressional Budget Office (referred to as "CBO") projects that the growth in health premiums will be 5.5 percent in 1998 up from 3.8 percent in 1997. CBO continues to project that premiums will grow about 1 percentage point faster than the Gross Domestic Product in the longer run. CBO also warns that new Federal mandates on health insurance could exacerbate this increase in premiums.
 - (12) The President's Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry developed the Consumer Bill of Rights and

1	Responsibilities. This includes information disclosure,
2	confidentiality of health information, and choice of
3	providers.
4	(13) The President's Commission further deter-
5	mined that private sector organizations have the ca-
6	pacity to act in a timely manner needed to keep pace
7	with the swiftly evolving health system.
8	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
9	ate that the assumptions underlying this resolution assume
10	that the Senate will not pass any health care legislation
11	that will—
12	(1) make health insurance unaffordable for work-
13	ing families and increase the number of uninsured
14	Americans;
15	(2) divert limited health care resources away
16	from serving patients to paying lawyers and hiring
17	new bureaucrats; or
18	(3) impose political considerations on clinical
19	decisions, instead of allowing such decisions to be
20	made on the basis of sound science and the best inter-
21	ests of patients.

1	SEC. 354. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE USE OF BUDGET
2	SURPLUS FOR TAX RELIEF OR DEBT REDUC-
3	TION.
4	It is the sense of the Senate that this resolution as-
5	sumes that any budget surplus should be dedicated to debt
6	reduction or direct tax relief for hard-working American
7	families.
8	SEC. 355. USE OF BUDGET SURPLUS TO REFORM SOCIAL SE-
9	CURITY.
10	It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions un-
11	derlying the functional totals included in the resolution as-
12	sume:
13	(1) The Congress and the President should use
14	any budget surplus to reduce the Social Security pay-
15	roll tax and to establish personal retirement accounts
16	with the tax reduction for hard-working Americans.
17	(2) The Congress and the President should not
18	use the Social Security surplus to finance general
19	Government programs and other spending, should
20	begin to build real assets for the trust funds, and
21	work to reform the Social Security system.
22	SEC. 356. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON COLOMBIAN DRUG
23	WAR HELICOPTERS.
24	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
25	(1) Colombia is the leading illicit drug produc-
26	ing country in the Western Hemisphere;

1	(2) 80 percent of the world's cocaine originates
2	$in\ Colombia;$
3	(3) based on the most recent data of the Drug
4	Enforcement Administration (DEA), more than 60
5	percent of the heroin seized in the United States origi-
6	nates in Colombia;
7	(4) in the last 10 years more than 4,000 officers
8	of the Colombian National Police have died fighting
9	the scourge of drugs;
10	(5) in one recent year alone, according to data
11	of the United States Government, the United States
12	had 141,000 new heroin users and the United States
13	faces historic levels of heroin use among teenagers be-
14	tween the ages of 12 and 17;
15	(6) once Colombian heroin is in the stream of
16	commerce it is nearly impossible to interdict because
17	it is concealed and trafficked in very small quantities;
18	(7) the best and most cost efficient method of pre-
19	venting Colombian heroin from entering the United
20	States is to destroy the opium poppies in the high
21	Andes mountains where Colombian heroin is pro-
22	duced;
23	(8) the elite anti-narcotics unit of the Colombian
24	National Police has the responsibility to eradicate
25	both coca and opium in Colombia, including the re-

- duction and elimination of cocaine and heroin production, and they have done a remarkably effective job with the limited and outdated equipment at their disposal;
 - (9) more than 40 percent of the anti-narcotics operations of the Colombian National Police involve hostile ground fire from narco-terrorists and 90 percent of such operations involve the use of helicopters;
 - (10) the need for better high performance helicopters by the Colombian National Police, especially for use in the high Andes mountains, is essential for more effective eradication of opium in Colombia;
 - (11) on December 23, 1997, one of the antiquated Vietnam-era UH-1H Huey helicopters used by the Colombian National Police in an opium eradication mission crashed in the high Andes mountains due to high winds and because it was flying above the safety level recommended by the original manufacturer;
 - (12) in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–118), amounts were appropriated for the procurement by the United States for the Colombian National Police of three UH–60L Blackhawk utility helicopters that can operate safely and more effectively at the high altitudes of the Andes moun-

- tains where Colombian opium grows at altitudes as
 high as 12,000 feet;
- 3 (13) the Blackhawk helicopter is a high perform4 ance utility helicopter, with greater lift capacity, that
 5 can perform at the high altitudes of the Andes moun6 tains, as well as survive crashes and sustain ground
 7 fire, much better than any other utility helicopter
 8 now available to the Colombian National Police in
 9 the war on drugs;
 - (14) because the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters that the United States has provided the Colombian National Police are outdated and have been developing numerous stress cracks, a sufficient number should be upgraded to Huey II's and the remainder should be phased-out as soon as possible;
 - (15) these Huey helicopters are much older than most of the pilots who fly them, do not have the range due to limited fuel capacity to reach many of the expanding locations of the coca fields or cocaine labs in southern Colombia, nor do they have the lift capacity to carry enough armed officers to reach and secure the opium fields in the high Andes mountains prior to eradication;
 - (16) the elite anti-narcotics unit of the Colombian National Police has a stellar record in respecting

- for human rights and has received the commendation
 of a leading international human rights group in
 their operations to reduce and eradicate illicit drugs
 in Colombia;
 - (17) the narco-terrorists of Colombia have announced that they will now target United States citizens, particularly those United States citizens working with their Colombian counterparts in the fight against illicit drugs in Colombia;
 - (18) a leading commander of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia ("FARC") announced recently that the objective of these narco-terrorists, in light of recent successes, will be "to defeat the Americans";
 - (19) United States Government personnel in Colombia who fly in these helicopters accompanying the Colombian National Police on missions are now at even greater risk from these narco-terrorists and their drug trafficking allies;
 - (20) in the last six months four anti-narcotics helicopters of the Colombian National Police have been downed in operations;
 - (21) Congress intends to provide the necessary support and assistance to wage an effective war on illicit drugs in Colombia and provide the equipment

1	and assistance needed to protect all of the men and
2	women of the Colombian National Police as well as
3	those Americans who work side by side with the Co-
4	lombian National Police in this common struggle
5	against illicit drugs;
6	(22) the new Government of Bolivia has made a
7	commitment to eradicate coca and cocaine production
8	in that country within 5 years;
9	(23) the United States should support any coun-
10	try that is interested in removing the scourge of drugs
11	from its citizens; and
12	(24) Bolivia has succeeded, in large measure due
13	to United States assistance, in reducing acreage used
14	to produce coca, which is the basis for cocaine produc-
15	tion.
16	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
17	ate that the functional totals underlying this resolution as-
18	sume that—
19	(1) the President should, with funds made avail-
20	able under Public Law 105–118, expeditiously pro-
21	cure and provide to the Colombian National Police
22	three UH-60L Blackhawk utility helicopters solely for
23	the purpose of assisting the Colombian National Po-
24	lice to perform their responsibilities to reduce and

eliminate the production of illicit drugs in Colombia

1	and the trafficking of such illicit drugs, including the
2	trafficking of drugs such as heroin and cocaine to the
3	United States;

- (2) if the President determines that the procurement and transfer to the Colombian National Police of three UH-60L Blackhawk utility helicopters is not an adequate number of such helicopters to maintain operational feasibility and effectiveness of the Colombian National Police, then the President should promptly inform Congress as to the appropriate number of additional UH-60L Blackhawk utility helicopters for the Colombian National Police so that amounts can be authorized for the procurement and transfer of such additional helicopters; and
- (3) assistance for Bolivia should be maintained at least at the level assumed in the fiscal year 1998 budget submission of the President and the Administration should act accordingly.

19 SEC. 357. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR MEDI-

20 CAL CARE FOR VETERANS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that \$40,274,000 in additional amounts above the President's budget levels will be and available for veterans health care for fiscal year 1999.

1	SEC. 358. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON OBJECTION TO THE
2	USE OF THE SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS TO
3	FUND CERTAIN PROGRAMS.
4	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that the Budget
5	Committee Report accompanying this resolution assumes
6	that the landowner incentive program of the Endangered
7	Species Recovery Act would be funded "from the gross re-
8	ceipts realized in the sales of excess BLM land: Provided,
9	That BLM has sufficient administrative funds to conduct
10	such sales".
11	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
12	ate that the functional totals underlying this resolution as-
13	sume that—
14	(1) the landowner incentive program included in
15	the Endangered Species Recovery Act should be fi-
16	nanced from a dedicated source of funding; and
17	(2) public lands should not be sold to fund the
18	landowner incentive program of the Endangered Spe-
19	cies Recovery Act through their proceeds alone, if sub-
20	sequent legislation provides an alternative or mixed,
21	dedicated source of mandatory funding.
22	SEC. 359. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING A MULTI-
23	NATIONAL ALLIANCE AGAINST DRUG TRAF-
24	FICKING.
25	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

1	(1) the traffic in illegal drugs greatly threatens
2	democracy, security and stability in the Western
3	Hemisphere due to the violence and corruption associ-
4	ated with drug trafficking organizations;
5	(2) drug trafficking organizations operate with-
6	out respect for borders or national sovereignty;
7	(3) the production, transport, sale, and use of il-
8	licit drugs endangers the people and legitimate insti-
9	tutions of all countries in the hemisphere;
10	(4) no single country can successfully confront
11	and defeat this common enemy;
12	(5) full bilateral cooperation with the United
13	States to reduce the flow of drugs is in the national
14	interests of our neighbors in the hemisphere;
15	(6) in addition, victory in the hemispheric battle
16	against drug traffickers requires expanded multilat-
17	eral cooperation among the nations of the region.
18	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
19	ate that the provisions of this resolution assume that in ad-
20	dition to existing bilateral cooperative efforts, the Adminis-
21	tration should promote at the Summit of the Americas and
22	in other for athe concept of a multinational hemispheric
23	"war alliance" bringing together the United States and key
24	illicit drug producing and transiting countries in the West-
25	ern Hemisphere for the purpose of implementing a coordi-

1	nated plan of action against illegal drug trafficking and
2	promoting full cooperation against this common menace.
3	SEC. 360. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING LEGISLATION
4	THAT INCREASES COMPLEXITY OF TAX RE-
5	TURNS.
6	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds the following:
7	(1) As part of the consideration by the Senate of
8	tax cuts for the families of America, the Senate should
9	also examine the condition of the Internal Revenue
10	Code of 1986.
11	(2) According to the Congressional Research
12	Service, the Revenue Reconciliation Act of 1997 added
13	1,000,000 words and 315 pages to the Internal Reve-
14	$nue\ Code.$
15	(3) The Internal Revenue Code continues to grow
16	more complex and difficult for the average taxpayer
17	to understand, and the average tax return has become
18	more time-consuming to prepare.
19	(4) The average taxpayer will spend 9 hours and
20	54 minutes preparing Form 1040 for the 1997 tax
21	year.
22	(5) The average taxpayer spends between 21 and
23	28 hours each year on tax matters.
24	(6) In 1995, 58,965,000 of the 118,218,327 tax
25	returns that were filed, almost 50 percent, were filed

1	by taxpayers who utilized the help of a paid tax pre-
2	parer.
3	(7) The average taxpayer spends \$72 each year
4	for tax preparation.
5	(8) The total burden on all taxpayers of main-
6	taining records, and preparing and filing tax returns
7	is estimated to be in excess of 1,600,000 hours per
8	year.
9	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
10	ate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that
11	the Senate should give priority to tax proposals that sim-
12	plify the tax code and reject proposals that add greater com-
13	plexity in the tax code and increased compliance costs for
14	the taxpayer.
15	SEC. 361. GENERAL PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF MARI-
16	JUANA FOR MEDICINAL PURPOSES.
17	It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this
18	resolution assume that no funds appropriated by Congress
19	should be used to provide, procure, furnish, fund or support,
20	or to compel any individual, institution or government en-
21	tity to provide, procure, furnish, fund or support, any item,
22	good, benefit, program or service, for the purpose of the use
23	of marijuana for medicinal purposes, except that this sec-

 $24\ \ tion\ shall\ not\ apply\ to\ medical\ research\ and\ investigational$

1	new drug programs under the jurisdiction of the Food and
2	$Drug\ Administration.$
3	SEC. 362. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AMTRAK
4	FUNDING.
5	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
6	(1) on November 13, 1997 the Senate unani-
7	mously passed the Amtrak Reform and Accountability
8	Act of 1997, Public Law 105–134, authorizing appro-
9	priations of \$1,058,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;
10	\$1,023,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; \$989,000,000 for
11	fiscal year 2001; and \$955,000,000 for fiscal year
12	2002, totaling \$4,025,000,000 for fiscal years 1999–
13	2002;
14	(2) in Public Law 105–134 the Congress declared
15	that "intercity rail passenger service is an essential
16	component of a national intermodal passenger trans-
17	portation system";
18	(3) section 201 of the Amtrak Reform and Ac-
19	countability Act of 1997 has now statutorily formal-
20	ized prior Congressional directives to Amtrak to reach
21	operating self-sufficiency by fiscal year 2002;
22	(4) the Congress and the President, through en-
23	actment of this legislation, have effectively agreed that
24	Congress will provide adequate funding to permit

1	Amtrak to achieve the goal of operating self-suffi-
2	ciency;
3	(5) capital investment is critical to reducing op-
4	erating costs and increasing the quality of Amtrak
5	service;
6	(6) capital investment is essential to improving
7	Amtrak's long-term financial health;
8	(7) the \$2,200,000,000 provided to Amtrak
9	through the Taxpayer Relief Act is for the sole pur-
10	pose of capital expenditures and other qualified ex-
11	penses and is intended to supplement, not supplant,
12	annual appropriations.
13	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
14	ate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals
15	in this budget resolution assume that Congress and the Ad-
16	ministration will fulfill the intent of the Amtrak Reform
17	and Accountability Act of 1997 and appropriate sufficient
18	funds in each of the next 5 fiscal years for Amtrak to imple-
19	ment its fiscal years 1998–2003 Strategic Business Plan,
20	while preserving the integrity of the \$2,200,000,000 pro-
21	vided under the Taxpayer Relief Act for the statutory pur-
22	pose of capital investment.
23	SEC. 363. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MARKET AC-
24	CESS PROGRAM.
25	(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

- 1 (1) The Market Access Program (MAP) continues 2 to be a vital and important part of United States 3 trade policy aimed at maintaining and expanding 4 United States agricultural exports, countering sub-5 sidized foreign competition, strengthening farm in-6 come and protecting American jobs. Further, the Sen-7 ate finds that:
 - (A) The Market Access Program is specifically targeted towards small business, farmer cooperatives and trade associations.
 - (B) The Market Access Program is administered on a cost-share basis. Participants, including farmers and ranchers, are required to contribute up to 50 percent or more toward the cost of the program.
 - (2) The Market Access Program has been a tremendous success by any measure. Since the program was established, United States agricultural exports have doubled. In fiscal year 1997, United States agricultural exports amounted to \$57,300,000,000, resulting in a positive agricultural trade surplus of approximately \$22,000,000,000, and contributing billions of dollars more in increased economic activity and additional tax revenues.

- 1 (3) The Market Access Program has also helped 2 maintain and create needed jobs throughout the Na-3 tion's economy. More than one million Americans 4 now have jobs that depend on United States agricul-5 tural exports. Further, every billion dollars in addi-6 tional United States agricultural exports helps create 7 as many as 17,000 or more new jobs.
 - (4) United States agriculture, including farm income and related jobs, is more dependent than ever on maintaining and expanding United States agricultural exports as Federal farm programs are gradually reduced under the FAIR Act of 1996.
 - (5) In addition to the Asian economic situation and exchange rate fluctuations, United States agricultural exports continue to be adversely impacted by continued subsidized foreign competition, artificial trade barriers and other unfair foreign trade practices.
 - (6) The European Union (EU) and other foreign competitors continue to heavily outspend the United States by more than 10 to 1 with regard to export subsidies.
- 23 (A) In 1997, the EU budgeted 24 \$7,200,000,000 for export subsidies aimed at

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

capturing a larger share of the world market at
 the expense of United States agriculture.

- (B) EU and other foreign competitors also spend nearly \$500,000,000 on market promotion activities. The EU spends more on wine promotion than the United States currently spends on all commodities and related agricultural products.
 - (C) The EU has announced a major new initiative aimed at increasing their exports to Japan—historically, the largest single market for United States agriculture exports.
- (7) United States agriculture is the most competitive industry in the world, but it cannot and should not be expected to compete alone against the treasuries of foreign governments.
- (8) Reducing or eliminating funding for the Market Access Program would adversely affect United States agriculture's ability to remain competitive in today's global marketplace. A reduction in United States agricultural exports would translate into lower farm income, a worsening trade deficit, slower economic growth, fewer export-related jobs, and a declining tax base.

1	(9) United States success in upcoming trade ne-
2	gotiations on agriculture scheduled to begin in 1999
3	depends on maintaining an aggressive trade strategy
4	and related policies and programs. Reducing or
5	eliminating the Market Access Program would rep-
6	resent a form of unilateral disarmament and weaken
7	the United States negotiating position.
8	(10) The Market Access Program is one of the
9	few programs specifically allowed under the current
10	Uruguay Round Agreement.
11	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
12	ate that funding for the Market Access Program (MAP)
13	should be fully maintained as authorized and aggressively
14	utilized by the United States Department of Agriculture to
15	encourage United States agricultural exports, strengthen
16	farm income, counter subsidized foreign competition, and
17	protect American jobs.
18	SEC. 364. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NA-
19	TIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.
20	(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
21	(1) heart disease was the leading cause of death
22	for both men and women in every year from 1970 to
23	1993;

1	(2) mortality rates for individuals suffering from
2	prostate cancer, skin cancer, and kidney cancer con-
3	tinue to rise;
4	(3) the mortality rate for African American
5	women suffering from diabetes is 134 percent higher
6	than the mortality rate of Caucasian women suffering
7	from diabetes;
8	(4) asthma rates for children increased 58 per-
9	cent from 1982 to 1992;
10	(5) nearly half of all American women between
11	the ages of 65 and 75 reported having arthritis;
12	(6) AIDS is the leading cause of death for Amer-
13	icans between the ages of 24 and 44;
14	(7) the Institute of Medicine has described
15	United States clinical research to be "in a state of
16	crisis" and the National Academy of Sciences con-
17	cluded in 1994 that "the present cohort of clinical in-
18	vestigators is not adequate";
19	(8) biomedical research has been shown to be ef-
20	fective in saving lives and reducing health care ex-
21	penditures;
22	(9) research sponsored by the National Institutes
23	of Health has contributed significantly to the first
24	overall reduction in cancer death rates since record-

keeping was instituted;

1	(10) research sponsored by the National Insti-
2	tutes of health has resulted in the identification of ge-
3	netic mutations for osteoporosis; Lou Gehrig's Dis-
4	ease, cystic fibrosis, and Huntington's Disease; breast,
5	skin and prostate cancer; and a variety of other ill-
6	nesses;
7	(11) research sponsored by the National Insti-
8	tutes of Health has been key to the development of
9	Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and Positron
10	Emission Tomography (PET) scanning technologies;
11	(12) research sponsored by the National Insti-
12	tutes of Health has developed effective treatments for
13	Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia (ALL). Today, 80
14	percent of children diagnosed with Acute
15	Lymphoblastic Leukemia are alive and free of the dis-
16	ease after 5 years; and
17	(13) research sponsored by the National Insti-
18	tutes of Health contributed to the development of a
19	new, cost-saving cure for peptic ulcers.
20	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
21	ate that the function totals in this budget resolution assume
22	that—
23	(1) appropriations for the National Institutes of
24	Health should be increased by 100 percent over the
25	next 5 fiscal years;

1	(2) appropriations for the National Institutes of
2	Health should be increased by \$2,000,000,000 in year
3	1999 over the amount appropriated in fiscal year
4	1998;
5	(3) the budget resolution takes a major step to-
6	ward meeting this goal; and
7	(4) at a minimum, appropriations for the Na-
8	tional Institutes of Health should match the rec-
9	ommendations provided in the budget resolution.
10	SEC. 365. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING DISPLAY OF
11	TEN COMMANDMENTS.
12	(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—
13	(1) the Ten Commandments have had a signifi-
14	cant impact on the development of the fundamental
15	legal principles of Western Civilization; and
16	(2) the Ten Commandments set forth a code of
17	moral conduct, observance of which is acknowledged
18	to promote respect for our system of laws and the
19	good of society.
20	(b) Sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Sen-
21	ate that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution
22	on the budget assume that—
23	(1) the Ten Commandments are a declaration of
24	fundamental principles that are the cornerstones of a
25	fair and just society; and

1	(2) the public display, including display in the
2	Supreme Court, the Capitol building, the White
3	House, and other government offices and courthouses
4	across the nation, of the Ten Commandments should
5	be permitted, as long as it is consistent with the es-
6	tablishment clause of the first amendment of the
7	United States Constitution.
	Attest:

Secretary.

105TH CONGRESS H. CON. RES. 284

AMENDMENT

HCON 284 EASHCON 284 EAS

HCON 284 EAS——2